H963-6

Union Calendar No. 609

99TH CONGRESS *2d Session*	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES	REPORT 99-1024

ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE YEAR 1985

OF THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

SCNAC-99-1-8

DECEMBER 19, 1986.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

65-441 O WASHINGTON : 1986

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, DC 20402

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

(99th Congress)

CHARLES B. RANGEL, New York, *Chairman*

PETER W. RODINO, JR., New Jersey
FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK, California
JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York
CARDISS COLLINS, Illinois
DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii
FRANK J. GUARINI, New Jersey
ROBERT T. MATSUI, California
DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
WALTER E. FAUNTROY, District of Columbia
WILLIAM J. HUGHES, New Jersey
MEL LEVINE, California
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas
LAWRENCE J. SMITH, Florida
EDOLPHUS "ED" TOWNS, New York

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
LAWRENCE COUGHLIN, Pennsylvania
E. CLAY SHAW, JR., Florida
MICHAEL G. OXLEY, Ohio
STAN PARRIS, Virginia
GENE CHAPPIE, California
DUNCAN HUNTER, California
JOSEPH J. DIOGUARDI, New York
MICHAEL L. STRANG, Colorado
JOHN G. ROWLAND, Connecticut

COMMITTEE STAFF

JOHN T. CUSACK, *Chief of Staff*
ELLIOTT A. BROWN, *Minority Staff Director*
DEBORAH E. BODLANDER, *Minority Professional Staff*
JOHN S.V. BROWN, *Metropolitan Police Detail*
CATHERINE M. CHASE, *Finance/Administrative Officer*
EDWARD J. FRICKER, *GPO Detail*
GEORGE R. GILBERT, *Staff Counsel*
REBECCA L. HEDLUND, *Executive Assistant*
EDWARD H. JURITH, *Staff Counsel*
MICHAEL J. KELLEY, *Staff Counsel*
JAMES W. LAWRENCE, *Minority Professional Staff*
RONALD A. LEGRAND, *Staff Counsel*
MARC R. LIPPMAN, *Staff Counsel*
WILLIAM MATHIS, *Staff Assistant*
KHALIL MUNIR, *Customs Detail*
PATRICIA J. REMICK, *Press Officer*
VICKIE L. SLEIMAN, *Minority Staff Assistant*
BARBARA A. STOLZ, *Professional Staff*
RUTHIE L. THOMPSON, *Staff Assistant*
MERITENE TRENT, *Staff Assistant*
LOUIS E. WILLIAMS, *GPO Detail*

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON
NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL,
Washington, DC, December 19, 1986.

Hon. BENJAMIN J. GUTHRIE,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. GUTHRIE: I am pleased to transmit the enclosed report entitled, "Annual Report for the Year 1985 of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, 99th Congress, First Session."

This report sets forth the activities of the Committee for calendar year 1985 in accordance with section 6(a)(2) of House Resolution 22. The report also makes a number of recommendations to the House of Representatives to control the worldwide problem of drug abuse and drug trafficking as required by section 6(a)(3) of House Resolution 22.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES B. RANGEL,
Chairman.

IV

CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of Transmittal	III
Committee Jurisdiction, Authority, Funding, and Organization	1
Introduction	1
Reconstitution of the Select Committee (H. Res. 22)	2
Funding of the Select Committee (H. Res. 100)	3
Committee Rules	3
Committee Membership	7
Committee Staff	7
Committee Meeting	7
Recommendations of the Select Committee to the House of Representatives	8
Introduction	8
Trends in the Traffic and Abuse of Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs	15
Cocaine	15
Heroin	17
Marijuana	19
Hashish	20
Psychotropic Drugs	20
Conclusions	22
Recommendations	23
Air Interdiction	23
The U.S. Coast Guard	23
Customs Drug Interdiction Programs	25
Federal Drug Enforcement	26
State and Local Drug Enforcement	27
Drug Abuse Prevention and Treatment	28
International Narcotics Control	30
Colombia	31
Ecuador	34
Peru	35
Bolivia	39
Brazil	42
Argentina	43
Uruguay	45
Nigeria	45
Morocco	46
Italy	47
Sri Lanka	48
India	48
Malaysia	50
Hong Kong	50
Thailand	51
Burma	52
Lebanon	53
Syria	54
Turkey	55
Iran	57
Afghanistan	58
Pakistan	59
Panama	61
Costa Rica	62
Nicaragua	62
Belize	64
Jamaica	65

Page

Recommendations of the Select Committee to the House of Representatives—Continued
Recommendations—Continued
International Narcotics Control—Continued
The Bahamas 66
Mexico 66
Venezuela 71
A National Drug Enforcement Strategy 72
Activities 74
Committee Hearings 74
Chicago (May 31 and June 1) 74
Cocaine (July 16) 76
International Narcotics Control (September 12) 80
New England (September 20 and 21) 81
Drug Abuse and High School Dropouts (September 27) 99
New York City—Drug Traffic and Abuse and AIDS (November 26) 102
Agency Briefings 107
INM (April 18) 107
Posse Comitatus—Military Assistance to Drug Law Enforcement (May 15, June 18) 108
DEA (June 5) 111
DEA—Domestic Marijuana Eradication (July 10) 112
Treasury—Customs, IRS, and BATF (July 25) 113
National Drug Enforcement Policy Board (October 29) 115
International Activities 117
United Nations Commission on Narcotics Drugs (February 15) 117
Chairman Rangel's Testimony on International Narcotics Control Before the House Foreign Affairs Committee (March 19) 118
Letter to the President (March 25) 118
Meeting with Attorney General Edwin Meese III (April 2) 119
25th Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, Queretaro, Mexico (May 9–13) 120
Study Mission to Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay (August 3–19) 122
U.N. Initiative to Control Illicit Drug Production and Trafficking (October 25) 127
Meetings with International Narcotics Control Officials 128
Introduction 128
State Department Officials 128
Jon R. Thomas, Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics Matters (April 18, July 10, August 23) 128
Daniel O'Donohue, Ambassador to Burma (February 6 and July 17) 128
William A. Brown, Ambassador-designate to Thailand (June 12) 129
David C. Jordan, Ambassador to Peru (June 20) 129
Charles A. Gillespie, Jr., Ambassador-designate to Colombia (July 13) 130
Diego C. Asencio, Ambassador to Brazil (November 8) 130
Lev E. Dobriansky, Ambassador to the Bahamas (November 12) 131
Elliott Abrams, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs (October 9) 132
Foreign Officials and Delegations 132
Maj. Gen. Victor Delgado Mallarino, Director General, National Police of Colombia (March 13) 132
Rodrigo Lloreda, Colombian Ambassador to the United States (March 26, October 22) 135
David Mellor, Parliamentary Undersecretary of State, Home Office, United Kingdom (April 10) 136
Participants in USIA's International Visitor Program, Multi-Regional Project on Drug Abuse Control (April 12) 137
House of Commons Select Committee on Home Affairs, United Kingdom (April 30) 138
Spanish Parliament Special Investigative Committee on the Problem of Trafficking and Consumption of Drugs in Spain (May 23) 139
Hon. Mariano Baptista, Bolivian Ambassador to the United States (June 11) 141

Activities—Continued
Meetings with International Narcotics Control Officials—Continued
Foreign Officials and Delegations—Continued
Page
Dr. Jose Paulo Cavalcanti, Secretary General, Ministry of Justice, Brazil (July 9) 141
Luis Marchand, Peruvian Ambassador to the United States (July 10, November 20) 142
Argentine Parliamentarians (September 9) 144
Undersecretary Raul Alconada, Foreign Ministry, and Jaime Malamud, Executive Director, National Drug Commission, Argentina (September 17) 145
Italian Interparliamentary Committee on the Mafia (October 4) 146
Gen. Edison Garces Pozo, Commander General, Ecuadorian National Police (October 10) 148
Mario Ribadeneria, Ecuadorian Ambassador to the United States (October 17) 148
Julio Garrett-Aillon, Vice President of Bolivia, Mariano Baptista, Bolivian Ambassador to the United States, and Jorge Gumeio, Bolivian Ambassador to the United Nations (October 18) 150
Sergio Correa da Costa, Brazilian Ambassador to the United States (October 23) 150
Dr. Giovanni Falcone, Investigating Magistrate, Palermo, Italy (November 14) 151
Activities in Support of Legislative Initiatives 151
H.R. 526, State and Local Narcotics Control Assistance Act of 1985 151
H.R. 1555, International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985 153
Military Assistance to Civilian Drug Interdiction Efforts 155
H.R. 3404, Narcotics Control Trade Act 157
H.R. 1625, Mail Order Drug Paraphernalia Control Act 157
H.R. 2013, Federal Drug Law Enforcement Agent Protection Act of 1985 158
H.R. 2768, Narcoterrorism Information Rewards Act of 1985 159
Designer Drugs 160
H.R. 380, National Drug and Alcohol Education Act of 1985 161
H.R. 3552, Funding for DEA Mid-Atlantic Laboratory 161
H.R. 3819, Precursor and Essential Chemicals Review Act of 1985 162
H.J. Res. 126, National Drug Abuse Education Week 162
H.R. 962, Exemption of the Bahamas from the Mansfield Amendment 163
H.R. 1242, Comprehensive Substance Abuse Education Act of 1985 164
H.R. 2068, FY 1986 and 1987 State Department Authorization Bill 164
Customs Funding, FY 1986 166
H.R. 2965, Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, and Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for FY 1986 166
Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Services (ADMS) Block Grant 167
Coast Guard Funding 168
H.R. 3424, Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1986 169
H.R. 3136 (Gibbons), Reimbursement to State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies for Costs Incurred in Their Criminal Investigations which Contribute to the Eventual Recovery of Federal Taxes 170
Medical Use of Heroin 170
Special Activities 172
Gulf State Governors' Conference on Drug Trafficking, New Orleans (January 17) 172
Chairman's Address to the U.S. Conference of Mayors, Human Development Committee (January 18) 173
Sponsorship of Showing Jacques Cousteau's Documentary, "Snowstorm in the Jungle" (February 25) 173
Reception for Peggy Mann, Author of "Marijuana Alert" (February 26) 174
Address to the National Alliance of State Drug Enforcement Agencies (May 6) 174
Hearing by the House Committee on the District of Columbia, Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs, on Drug Abuse and Drug Trafficking in Washington, DC (April 17) 175
INTERPOL, 54th General Assembly, Reception (October 2) 176
Congressman Akaka's Speech to Hawaiian Law Enforcement Officials (August 30) 177

Special Activities—Continued

	Page
Congressional Advisory Committee on Drug Trafficking and Substance Abuse	177
Senate Drug Enforcement Caucus Hearing on the Cost of Drug Abuse Treatment and Prevention for Youth (August 20)	178
Representative Gilman Testifies on New York State Drug Plan (September 13)	185
Members' District Activities	185
Staff Liaison with Interested Groups and Organizations	186
GAO Report to the Select Committee on Federal Drug Abuse Funding	187

Union Calendar No. 609

99TH CONGRESS *2d Session* | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | REPORT 99-1024

ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE YEAR 1985 OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

DECEMBER 19, 1986.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. RANGEL, from the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, submitted the following

REPORT

COMMITTEE JURISDICTION, AUTHORITY, FUNDING, AND ORGANIZATION

INTRODUCTION

The House of Representatives in the 99th Congress [1] continued the mandate of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control which was first enacted in the 94th Congress.[2] From its inception more than nine years ago, the Committee's primary mandate from the House has remained basically the same, "to conduct continuing oversight and review of the problems of narcotics, drug, and polydrug abuse and control." The Committee was first established by the House in 1976 and has been reconstituted by the 95th, 96th, 97th, 98th and 99th Congresses.[3]

The Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control is unique because it is the only congressional committee with the broad responsibility and authority to examine the problems of drug abuse and drug trafficking prevention and control in their entirety. The issues involved are extremely complex and cut across a wide range of public policy concerns including law enforcement, the administration of criminal justice, health and health care delivery, environmental safety, education, international relations, national security, and government organization.

[1] H. Res. 22, 99th Congress adopted Mar. 7, 1985.
[2] H. Res. 1350, 94th Congress, adopted July 26, 1976.
[3] H. Res. 77, 95th Congress, adopted Jan. 11, 1977; H. Res. 3, 96th Congress, adopted Mar. 21, 1979; H. Res. 13, 97th Congress, adopted Feb. 25, 1981; H. Res. 49, 98th Congress, adopted Feb. 8, 1983.

The Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control possesses oversight, but no legislative, jurisdiction. The Committee is both a fact-finding and coordinating body. Through its hearings and other activities, the Committee provides an overview of the drug abuse problem, focuses congressional and public attention on critical drug-related issues, and supports actions by the standing committees of the House with legislative jurisdiction for narcotics abuse and control. Although not empowered to report legislation, the Select Committee recommends legislative initiatives to the appropriate standing committees and assists their legislative efforts. To facilitate a coordinated approach to drug abuse issues by the House, the Select Committee's membership includes representatives from nine standing committees with jurisdiction over various aspects of drug abuse prevention and control.

RECONSTITUTION OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE (H. Res. 22)

The text of House resolution 22 providing for the continuation of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control during the 99th Congress is reproduced on the following pages. The resolution passed by a vote of 310–94 on March 7, 1985.

H. RES. 22

Resolved, That there is hereby established in the House of Representatives a select committee to be known as the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control (hereinafter referred to as the "select committee").

FUNCTIONS

SEC. 2. The select committee shall not have legislative jurisdiction. The select committee shall have authority—

(1) to conduct continuing oversight and review of the problems of narcotics, drug, and polydrug abuse and control, including (but not limited to) the study and review of (A) the abuse and control of opium and its derivatives, other narcotic drugs, psychotropics, and other controlled substances, as defined in the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970, and any such drug or substances when used in combination with any other substances; (B) domestic and international trafficking, manufacturing, and distribution; (C) treatment, prevention, and rehabilitation; (D) narcotics-related violations of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; (E) international treaties and agreements relating to the control of narcotics and drug abuse; (F) the role of organized crime in narcotics and drug abuse; (G) problems of narcotics and drug abuse and control in the Armed Forces of the United States; (H) problems of narcotics and drug abuse and control in industry; and (I) the approach of the criminal justice system with respect to narcotics and drug law violations and crimes related to drug abuse;

(2) to review any recommendations made by the President, or by any department or agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government, relating to programs or policies affecting narcotics or drug abuse or control; and

(3) to recommend to the appropriate committees of the House legislation or other action the select committee considers necessary with respect to programs or policies affecting narcotics or drug abuse or control.

APPOINTMENT AND MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 3. (a) The select committee shall be composed of twenty-five Members of the House, who shall be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. At least one member of the select committee shall be chosen from each of the following committees of the House: The Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Ways and Means.

(b) Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the select committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "Members" shall mean any Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the House of Representatives.

AUTHORITY AND PROCEDURES

SEC. 4. (a) For purposes of carrying out this resolution the select committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, or elsewhere, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary.

(b) The provisions of clauses 1, 2, and 3 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the select committee.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 5. (a) Subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 5 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the select committee may incur expenses in connection with its duties under this resolution.

(b) In carrying out its functions under this resolution, the select committee is authorized—

(1) to appoint, either on a permanent basis or as experts or consultants, such staff as the select committee considers necessary;

(2) to prescribe the duties and responsibilities of such staff;

(3) to fix the compensation of such staff at a single per annum gross rate which does not exceed the highest rate of basic pay, as in effect from time to time, of level V of the Executive Schedule in section 5316 of title 5, United States Code;

(4) to terminate the employment of any such staff as the select committee considers appropriate; and

(5) to reimburse members of the select committee and of its staff for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties and responsibilities for the select committee, other than expenses in connection with any meeting of the select committee held in the District of Columbia.

REPORTS

SEC. 6. (a)(1) The select committee shall report to the House with respect to the results of any field investigation or inspection it conducts.

(2) The select committee shall submit an annual report to the House which shall include a summary of the activities of the select committee during the calendar year to which the report applies.

(3) The select committee shall report to the House its recommendations for a comprehensive program to control the worldwide problem of drug abuse and drug trafficking.

(b) Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

FUNDING OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE (H. Res. 100)

Funds for the operation of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control during 1985 were provided in H. Res. 100, the omnibus measure authorizing amounts for expenses of investigations and studies by standing and select committees of the House in the first session of the 99th Congress. Approved March 26, 1985, the resolution included $662,952 for the Select Committee.

COMMITTEE RULES

On April 3, 1985, the Select Committee adopted the following rules for the 99th Congress:

RULES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

RULE 1. GENERAL

The Rules of the House of Representatives, to the extent they apply, together with the following rules, shall be the rules of the Committee.

RULE 2. MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting day of the Committee for the conduct of its business shall be on the second Thursday of each month while the Congress is in session.

(b) Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman and a regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with when, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no need therefor.

(c) Special meetings may be convened as provided for by clause 2(c)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(d) At least 3 days (excluding Saturday, Sundays, and legal public holidays) before each scheduled Committee meeting, each member of the Committee shall be furnished a list of the subjects to be considered or acted upon at such meeting.

RULE 3. HEARINGS

(a) Members of the Committee shall be advised and a public announcement shall be made of the time, date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by the Committee at least one week before the commencement of such hearing, unless the Chairman determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date, in which event the Chairman shall advice Committee members and make the public announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this paragraph shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest and promptly entered into the committee scheduling service of the House Information Systems.

(b) Unless authorized by the Chairman, a witness shall not be permitted to testify or present evidence at a hearing of the Committee, and such testimony or evidence may not be included in the Committee hearing record, unless 50 copies thereof have been delivered to the Committee at least 48 hours prior to such hearing.

(c) A Committee member may question a witness only when recognized by the Chairman for such purpose. In accordance with clause 2(j)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, each Committee member shall be allowed 5 minutes to question a witness until each member who so desires has had such opportunity. The Chairman shall, insofar as practicable, recognize alternately on the basis of seniority those majority and minority members present at the time the hearing was called to order and others on the basis of their arrival at the hearing. Thereafter, additional time may be extended at the discretion of the Chairman.

(d) At any hearing the minority party members of the Committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of them before the completion of the hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to the subject matter of such hearing during at least one day of hearing thereon.

(e)(1) The Chairman at an investigative hearing of the Committee shall announce in the opening statement the subject of the investigation.

(2) A copy of the Rules of the Committee and clause 2 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House shall be made available to each witness.

(3) Witnesses at an investigative hearing may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

(4) The Chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearing; and the Committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(f) Any witness may obtain a transcript copy of his or her testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by a majority of the members voting a majority being present.

RULE 4. COMMITTEE PROCEDURE

(a)(1) Unless otherwise required or permitted by these rules, one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of Committee business. Any Committee member present at a Committee meeting may make a point of order that a quorum is not present, but a quorum shall be deemed present unless a member who is present objects.

(2) Two members shall constitute a quorum for the purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

(b) Meetings for the transaction of business and hearings of the Committee shall be open to the public or closed, in accordance with clauses 2(g)(1), 2(g)(2), or 2(k)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House. No evidence of testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public session unless authorized by a majority of members voting, a majority being present.

(c) A vote by any member of the Committee with respect to any matter being considered by the Committee may be cast by proxy if the proxy authorization is in writing, asserts that the member is absent on official business or is otherwise unable to be present at the meeting of the Committee, designates the member of the Committee who is to execute the proxy authorization, and is limited to a specific matter and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto (except that a member may authorize a general proxy for motions to recess or adjourn, or for the other procedural matters). Each proxy to be effective shall be signed by the member assigning his vote and shall contain the date and time of day that the proxy is signed. No proxy may be counted for the purpose of constituting a quorum.

(d) Every motion made to the Committee and entertained by the Chairman shall be reduced to writing upon the demand of any member, and a copy made available to each member present.

(e) In the absence of the chairman at any meeting or hearing of the Committee, the ranking member of the majority party on the Committee who is present shall preside at such meeting or hearing.

(f) A complete record of all Committee action, including a record of all votes on any question on which a rollcall vote is demanded, shall be maintained by the Committee. The result of each such rollcall vote shall be available to the public for inspection at the offices of the Committee during normal working hours.

(g) Any member of the Committee may demand and the Chairman shall order a rollcall vote on any matter considered by the Committee.

RULE 5. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (b), any Committee report shall be approved by a majority of the members voting at a meeting at which a majority is present.

(2) A proposed report shall not be considered in a Committee meeting unless a copy of the proposed report is provided to each member of the Committee at least 5 days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal public holidays) prior to the meeting.

(b) The Chairman is empowered to obtain the approval of any report in any appropriate manner, including by polling the members of the Committee in writing. In such cases, a copy of the proposed report shall be made available to each Committee member for at least 5 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal public holidays) and the approval of a majority of the Committee is required. The Chairman shall promptly notify Committee members in writing of the approval or disapproval of the proposed report.

(c) Supplemental, minority, or additional views may be filed in accordance with clause 2(a)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House. The time allowed for filing such views shall be 3 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal public holidays) after approval of a proposed report in a meeting of the Committee or after the Chairman issues a notification of approval pursuant to paragraph (b).

(d) If hearings have been held on the subject matter of the proposed report, every reasonable effort shall be made to have such hearings available to the members of the Committee before seeking approval of the proposed report.

RULE 6. POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEE

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties, the Committee is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, or elsewhere, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned.

(b)(1) The Committee may require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, documents, and other exhibits and materials, as it deems necessary.

(2) A subpena may be authorized and issued by the Committee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present.

(3) Notwithstanding subparagraph (b)(2) of this rule, a subpena may be authorized and issued in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities

by the Chairman upon the concurrence of the ranking minority member on the Committee.

(4) Authorized subpenas shall be signed by the Chairman or by any member designated by the Committee, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman or such member.

(c) The Chairman, or any member of the Committee designated from time to time by him, shall report on the meetings, hearings or other activities of the Committee to any other committee of the House which has subject matter jurisdiction therein.

RULE 7. BROADCASTING

(a) Whenever any hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee is open to the public, the Committee may permit such hearing or meeting to be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, under the rules established by paragraph (b) of this rule: Provided, however, that the Chairman shall determine, in his discretion, the number of television and still cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room.

(b)(1) If television or radio coverage of any hearing or meeting of the Committee is to be presented to the public as live coverage, such coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(2) No witness served with a subpena by the Committee shall be required against his or her will to be photographed at any hearing or meeting or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of such hearing or meeting, by radio or television, is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off.

(3) The allocation among the television media of the positions of the number of television cameras permitted by the Chairman shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(4) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the Committee, or the visibility of such witness and such members to each other.

(5) Televison cameras shall not be placed in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by other media.

(6) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from the hearing or meeting room while the Committee is in session.

(7) Floodlights, spotlights, strobelights, and flashguns shall not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting, except that the television media may install additional lighting in the hearing or meeting room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in the hearing or meeting room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing or meeting at the then current state of the art of televison coverage.

(8) In the allocation of the number of still photographers permitted by the Chairman to cover a hearing or meeting, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos and United Press International Newspictures. If requests are made by more of the media than will be permitted by the Chairman, for coverage of a hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(9) Photographers shall not position themselves at any time during the course of the hearing or meeting between the witness table and the members of the Committee.

(10) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by other media.

(11) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be then currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries

(12) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be then currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery.

(13) Personnel providing coverage by the televison and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

RULE 8. AMENDMENT OF RULES

The Rules of the Committee may be modified, amended, or repealed, by a majority of the members voting at a meeting at which a majority is present. Written notice

of any proposed change shall be provided to each member of the committee not less than 3 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal public holidays) before the meeting date on which such change is to be considered.

Committee Membership

The membership of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control is listed on page II of this report. The Committee membership stands at 25 members pursuant to H. Res. 22, 99th Congress, the same number as served on the committee in the 98th Congress. In the 98th Congress, House Resolution 49 required that the membership of the select committee include at least one member from each of the following eight standing committees: Agriculture; Armed Services; Energy and Commerce; Foreign Affairs; Government Operations; Judiciary; Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and Ways and Means. House Resolution 22 requires that, in addition to members from these committees, a member from the Veterans' Affairs Committee also be appointed to the select committee. This change reflects an agreement reached during floor consideration of House Resolution 49 during the 98th Congress that a member from the Veterans' Affairs Committee should serve on the select committee. A member from the Veterans' Affairs Committee did serve on the select committee throughout the 98th Congress.

Committee Staff

The Select Committee's average staff level during 1985 consisted of 12 professional staff and 4 staff assistants. In addition, Customs and the Washington Metropolitan Police Department each detailed an employee to the Committee for the year to assist the Select Committee on long term research projects. During the summer months, student interns joined the staff and assisted the Select Committee in its work. The Select Committee's printing and editorial needs were handled by two detailees from the Government Printing Office. A complete list of the committee staff as of December 31, 1985, is listed on page II of this report.

Committee Meeting

The Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control met to transact business on April 3, 1985. The Select Committee adopted rules for the 99th Congress, and the members discussed the Select Committee's agenda for 1985.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

INTRODUCTION

During 1985, the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control continued its examination of Federal policies and programs to curtail the illicit production, manufacture and traffic of narcotic and psychotropic drugs and to prevent and treat drug abuse.

In 1985, the drug trafficking industry in the United States continued to expand to an estimated $120 billion a year business.

This underground economy spawns crime, violence and corruption; threatens legitimate business; diminishes industrial productivity and creates a serious drain on our national economy.

In addition to human suffering, estimates of the social and economic costs of drug abuse prevention, treatment, related crime, violence, death, property destruction, lost productivity and drug enforcement will total an additional $100 billion.

Drug abuse which has been a serious health problem in the United States for two decades is now emerging as a major national public health threat by virtue of the magnitude of the population using cocaine, heroin and marijuana and a variety of other narcotic and psychotropic depressants, stimulants and hallucinogens. This public health menace was dramatically magnified in 1985 by recognition that intravenous drug users, particularly heroin addicts, have a very high rate of contracting and spreading the Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome, known as AIDS.

It is estimated that there are between 500,000 and 600,000 active heroin addicts in the United States. Their number has been growing on an annual basis since 1979 as supplies in the way of quantity and quality of the drug has gradually increased.

About 25 million people are reported to use marijuana regularly in the United States and as many as 40 million may use it occasionally. An estimated 25 million are occasional or regular users of cocaine in this country with an estimated 600,000 to 1,200,000 addicted to the substance. The results of the 1984 survey which reported that 5,000 people in the United States try cocaine for the first time each day continues to be valid. On the basis of increased availability of cocaine at lower or stable prices, the estimate of 5,000 new experimenters with cocaine every day may be conservative.

In addition to the use of marijuana, cocaine and heroin, the abuse of psychotropics, PCP, amphetamine, methamphetamine and LSD has continued to increase. An estimated 7 million people abused the various forms of stimulants, depressants and hallucinogenic forms of psychotropic substances during 1985.

The dramatic decline in the abuse of methaqualone, first noted in 1984, continued during 1985. This depressant form of psychotrop-

ic substances had been widely available and heavily abused for more than a decade. A prohibition on its legal manufacture in the United States and diplomatic initiatives abroad that persuaded the Peoples Republic of China and Hungary to strengthen their controls over the legal export of the chemical precursors to countries where methaqualone was being clandestinely formulated for trafficking to the United States was responsible for virtually eliminating the availability and abuse of methaqualone in this country. In 1983 methaqualone was number seven in the number of drug overdose fatalities and number six in the number of non-fatal hospital emergency treatment episodes.

Notwithstanding this clear evidence that the dramatic curtailment of availability of a drug creates a dramatic curtailment in the abuse of the drug, 1985 has been the year when many Federal, State and local officials charged with the responsibility to limit the availability of illicit drugs have stated that success in reducing drug abuse will only come by reducing the demand for drugs. Simultaneously, officials, practitioners and experts in the fields of drug abuse prevention and treatment state that it is extremely difficult to successfully prevent and treat drug abuse when the drugs of abuse are increasingly available, are of higher quality and offered at stable or lower prices.

In September 1984, the Reagan Administration issued the 1984 National Strategy for Prevention of Drug Abuse and Drug Trafficking. It was essentially similar to a strategy document issued in October 1982. Both documents promulgated a strategy that would bring the traffic and abuse of narcotics and psychotropic substances in the United States under control through the application of the classic principles of narcotics control. This included international cooperation to control the illicit production and traffic of narcotic and psychotropic drugs abroad affecting the United States, drug interdiction and enforcement at home along with drug abuse education, prevention and treatment programs.

In a departure from prior strategy documents where the elements of the Federal narcotic strategy were of relatively equal importance, the 1984 strategy makes drug abuse prevention and education the foremost objective in our nation's drug abuse control effort.

President Reagan himself underscored this change in emphasis. In his remarks at the signing ceremony for "National Drug Abuse Education and Prevention Week" on September 21, 1984, he said:

> With all due respect for Attorney General Smith and the Justice Department and all the others in our drug abuse program here, in the attempt to intercept and keep drugs from crossing our borders and coming into the country, I think we all know that the real victory will only come not when we keep trying—just trying to take the drug away from the customers—when we take the customers away from the drugs. And that's when we'll win the fight.

Up until now, society's efforts to prevent man from using narcotic and psychotropic drugs, except for medical purposes, has been to prevent the availability of the drug to the world-be user. Recogniz-

ing that this could never be perfect, warnings and information on the dangers of the non-medical use of narcotics and psychotropics have been traditionally promulgated by society in the hope of preventing people from experimenting with and falling victim to drug abuse. Medical science as well as governments and the international narcotics control conventions have long recognized that those falling victim to dependence on narcotic and psychotropic drugs required treatment and therapy.

In the 77 years of a concerted international effort to bring drug abuse to acceptable levels, success has only come when supply over both short and long periods of time was substantially reduced. Nowhere can it be demonstrated that when narcotic and psychotropic drugs were easily accessible that education and information programs alone halted the spread of drug abuse. In an environment where there is a proliferation of illicit drug availability, epidemic drug abuse follows commensurate with availability. Drug abuse education will save some or many from falling victim to this phenomenon. Unfortunately there are far too many individuals in any society that reject the education and information programs designed to prevent drug abuse.

When experts in the field of drug abuse prevention and treatment are asked why medical doctors and nurses who possess the highest levels of education and knowledge of the dangers of non-medical drug use have a higher rate of drug abuse than any other profession, their response is that they fell victim to their easy access to narcotic and psychotropic drugs in their work.

The victims of drug abuse either through ignorance or arrogance tend to underestimate the inherent dependence producing properties of the illicit drug with which they are experimenting and to overestimate their own human ability to control the use of a dependence producing drug.

This human failing has proven to be universal. When drugs are available, they will be used; the more they are available, the more they will be used.

We as a nation are failing to reduce the availability of all the illicit narcotic and psychotropic drugs being consumed in the United States and in fact on an annual basis with the exception of methaqualone they all have been significantly increasing in availability since 1979. Simultaneously our efforts to prevent and treat drug abuse have during the same period of time failed to prevent a steady increase in the number of the abusers of the widely available narcotic and psychotropic drugs across the nation.

This Committee supports the strategy goals of the Administration to simultaneously curtail the supply of illicit drugs and reduce demand through drug abuse prevention and treatment programs. This strategy is tried and proven and has brought short term and long term successes in the past. It is not now working because the funding, manpower, resources and priority assigned to it have been dramatically outpaced by an unprecedented volume of narcotic and psychotropic drug production and traffic originating at home and abroad providing an unlimited supply of drugs that continue to create and sustain increasing levels of drug abuse dependence and addiction.

In 1984, approximately $1.43 billion was appropriated for overall drug law enforcement by the Federal Government; in 1985, approximately $1.65 billion; and for 1986, an estimated $1.7 billion. During this same period of time the dollar value of drug addiction in the United States increased at an estimated rate of $10 billion per year as the quantities of cocaine, heroin, and marijuana smuggled from abroad increased as did domestic marijuana production and the illicit manufacture and traffic of psychotropic drugs within the country.

Funding provided for all health related drug abuse prevention and treatment programs over a period of time when illicit drug availability was rising was woefully inadequate to educate and warn our children, youth and all citizens of the dangers of illicit drug usage and treat victims at about $355 million in 1984; $400 million in 1985; and $400 million in 1986. For 1986, the Department of Education with a budget of $18 billion, allocated $3 million for drug abuse prevention. The bulk of the health-related drug abuse program was assigned to treatment and rehabilitation totaling about $186 million in 1984; $203 million in 1985; and $200 million in 1986. For the same years, prevention and education programs were assigned about $43 million in 1984; $46 million in 1985; and $46 million in 1986.

During 1985, on the basis of its oversight investigation of the production and traffic abroad of coca and cocaine, opium and marijuana, this Committee found that our foreign policy and diplomatic efforts are failing to persuade the major drug producing nations with our financial and technical support to assume their obligation under the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961 to eradicate illicit narcotic production and effectively suppress trafficking. During 1985, all indicators and evidence pointed to a continuing and dramatic increase in the illicit production and traffic of coca and cocaine affecting the United States from South America.

There is no credible evidence that illicit opium production in 1985 either increased or decreased. There is convincing evidence of a sharp increase in the illicit traffic and availability of heroin affecting the United States and most industrialized nations. Presumedly increased heroin trafficking would mean an increase in heroin manufacture which in turn would require increased opium production.

Reports of significant marijuana eradication in Colombia and Jamaica in 1985 have not yet brought a significant reduction in supply from these sources. Marijuana production and trafficking from Mexico reportedly increased following a trend that surfaced in 1984 after many years of successful eradication.

This uncontrolled illicit production of narcotic drugs abroad will continue unless the United States in concert with its allies, all friendly countries and the United Nations, comes to a mutual understanding with all the major illicit producer countries on the extent of their problem and what they are required to do under the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs to bring the production under control. A way must be found to convince and assist the producer countries to overcome the hard political realities of eliminating or eradicating as necessary the enormous and expanding illicit culti-

vation of coca, opium and marijuana which is creating and sustaining the current worldwide drug problem.

Up until now with the major source countries now affecting the United States, our failure has been due to our reluctance to make compliance with the narcotic control obligations of the Single Convention a sufficiently high priority in our relationship with them to cause the necessary corrective action to be taken.

The cost in U.S. and other international donor assistance to help the producer nations implement narcotic control measures would be modest. Lack of funding has not been responsible for the absence of effective action programs in drug producing countries. In 1984 and 1985 the State Department could not expend respectively about 25 percent and 16 percent of the funds allocated for narcotic assistance because of an inability to negotiate programs of action in producer countries that would warrant assistance.

This committee stands ready to support an increase in State Department funds for illicit narcotic crop elimination programs whenever such programs can be negotiated by the State Department.

Confronted with a rising level of marijuana and cocaine smuggling by vessels and aircraft penetrating our coast line and southern border, we have not provided the Coast Guard or the Customs Service with sufficient patrol vessels and aircraft, radar and other equipment, manpower and operating funds to effectively defend the nation against narcotic smuggling. The Drug Enforcement Administration has not been provided adequate manpower, equipment and funding to develop sufficient drug smuggling intelligence and investigations to enable the Coast Guard and Customs to be more effective in interdicting drug shipments. Even more distressing are reports that on some occasions when DEA did provide reliable information on air and sea smuggling suspects, Coast Guard and Customs lacked the resources to respond.

The inability to prevent the bulk of the narcotic smuggling directed at the United States in concert with the Coast Guard and Customs leaves DEA with the Federal responsibility to suppress the enormous organized interstate traffic of cocaine, heroin and marijuana entering the country. DEA simply has not had the manpower and operating resources to effectively perform its anti-smuggling and narcotic enforcement role effectively. It concentrates on the most important violators and organizations. As a result, great numbers of important traffickers can avoid arrest and prosecution, and an availability of drugs blankets the nation. The Administration's attempt to enhance drug enforcement resources by giving the FBI concurrent narcotics jurisdiction in 1982 has had no impact on reducing the supply of illicit drugs in our country.

Even by concentrating on the major violators there are complaints that there are some instances where there are too few Federal prosecutors and judges to handle that caseload. Notwithstanding effective work by the Coast Guard, Customs and DEA man for man and unit for unit, collectively their rate of drug seizures, arrests and convictions is insufficient to meaningfully reduce the availability of drugs and immobilize sufficient numbers of traffickers to have impact on the problem. This is because each year since 1979 the volume of cocaine and heroin and marijuana directed at

the United States has substantially increased while enforcement has not kept pace.

Regrettably, while the Congress in 1981 authorized military support to the drug enforcement agencies to suppress smuggling and expanded that authority in 1985, the assistance provided, while helpful, has not had an impact in reducing the problem. This is because the national defense need for constant military readiness prevents the military from dedicating the level of resources that could impact on smuggling prevention.

The inability of the Federal Government to prevent the entry and distribution of marijuana, cocaine and heroin nationwide has created a drug trafficking and abuse problem of such proliferation and volume that it overwhelms the state and local criminal justice and drug abuse prevention and treatment systems. It is in our local communities where the degradation and destructiveness of chronic drug abuse with its crime and violence takes its human toll. State and local police, narcotics enforcement services, prosecuting attorneys, courts and judges and prison systems all lack the personnel, facilities, equipment and funding to effectively suppress the wholesale and retail drug trafficking and related crime infecting their jurisdictions. In this environment drug abuse flourishes.

With the exception of some modest support funding from DEA for joint task force operations where local forces support the Federal effort, the burden of protecting our communities from the ravages of drug trafficking are left to the state and local governments.

In January 1985 Chairman Rangel and Ranking Minority Member Gilman cosponsored H.R. 526, "The State and Local Narcotics Control Assistance Act of 1985." It provides for $750 million annually over a period of 5 years, broken down into six categories funded at $125 million each where states and local communities need help because of the Federal failure to prevent the entry into the United States of the flood of cocaine, heroin and marijuana inundating their communities.

The categories to be funded are: (1) narcotic enforcement; (2) prosecution units; (3) courts and judges; (4) penal facilities; (5) narcotic crop eradication; and (6) drug prevention, education and treatment programs.

From 1984 through 1986 the Federal Government has made available an average of $115–$120 million for state and local drug abuse prevention, education and treatment. This level of funding is about 40 percent less than what was provided in 1980. Hearings this year brought complaints by state authorities that these cuts in Federal drug abuse assistance have hampered their efforts to prevent and treat drug abuse. They state that cuts have come at a time when drug availability and use has been on the rise; that treatment facilities are operating over capacity and there are long waiting lists for people seeking treatment.

In 1982, the role of the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) in providing funding for drug abuse prevention and treatment to the States through "categorical grants" was eliminated. This system provided funds for specific programs that met and conformed to guidelines and standards set by the Federal Government. Historically dating back to the 1930's the Federal Government pioneered programs for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse

and conducted research into the causes and treatment of drug abuse. Through the categorical grant system and its depth of research and technical expertise the Federal Government through NIDA set the direction of drug abuse prevention and treatment programs and maintained an active leadership role. The Federal "block grant" system established in 1982 provided lump sum funds to the states to be used for prevention and treatment programs at the states' discretion. NIDA became basically a research agency, and while it may not have been intended, the Federal Government's role in setting direction and providing leadership on drug abuse prevention and treatment has withered.

In addition to complaints the Committee receives from prevention and treatment professionals of the insufficient funding provided to the states by the Federal Government to prevent and treat drug abuse, there are complaints that the Federal Government is failing to recognize the enormity of the national public health problem posed by drug abuse. They contend a lack of policy direction and leadership has failed to effectively mobilize the country in a united Federal, State and local effort to effectively prevent drug abuse and treat all the unfortunate victims that seek treatment.

The lack of a well organized and administered Federal program in concert with State and local authorities across the nation to prevent and treat drug abuse does not square with repeated statements by the Administration of the need to reduce the demand for drugs and to take the customer away from the seller.

The treatment of drug abusers is a major component of demand reduction. Since drug abuse spreads from person to person like an infectious disease, drug abusers in treatment not only end their own use of drugs, but they are also prevented from infecting other susceptible individuals.

Professionals involved in drug abuse education programs regard them as imperative for the years kindergarten through high school (K through 12). This is regarded as the most reliable way to ensure that children and adolescents are provided the best education possible to develop an understanding of the dangers of illicit drug use and a predisposition to resist invitations to try to experiment with drugs. There is a consensus that not only should the Federal Government encourage the States to establish K through 12 drug education programs, but also that the Federal Government is the only entity that can provide the coordination and research needed in such a program.

This Committee was astonished by the spate of drug abuse education activity in recent months by Federal, State and local narcotics enforcement officers appearing in primary and secondary school classrooms to lecture on the dangers of drug abuse. If this is to focus recognition on the lack of effective school based drug abuse education programs, the Committee supports this activity. However, a solution to the hit or miss educational approach to date cannot be brought about by drug enforcement personnel replacing professional teachers in drug abuse education. Effective drug abuse education K through 12 can only be delivered by professional teachers utilizing well planned and structured curricula. The teachers' work can be enhanced by periodic guest speakers such as

drug enforcement personnel, sports figures, medical professionals and former abusers to speak out against trying illicit drugs.

Given the magnitude of illicit drug trafficking, diverting professional drug enforcement officers from their supply reduction function to provide drug abuse education in place of teachers is misguided. Given the current drug epidemic we need teachers as competent and well trained to teach drug abuse prevention courses as they are to teach the basic academics. The school environment is where drug abuse education can best be provided. Illicit drug availability and use is so pervasive today the subject is likely to come up and invite discussion in a variety of courses. This creates a need for all teachers to be trained to intelligently deal with the issue whenever and wherever it arises.

There is a need now for the President to lead his administration in a reaffirmation of the historic commitment of the United States to bring narcotic and psychotropic drug availability to the irreducible minimum and to educate and inform our people as to the dangers of illicit drug use and to humanely ensure the availability of treatment to the unfortunate victims who seek help.

Trends in the Traffic and Abuse of Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs

Cocaine

In its Annual Report for 1984, released on January 3, 1985, this Committee reported that an estimated 85 tons of cocaine were consumed in the United States in 1984. An additional 11.7 tons were seized indicating that about 96.7 tons were directed at the United States. The U.S. National Narcotics Intelligence Estimate for 1984 released in November 1985 reported that for 1984 an estimated 71 to 137 tons of cocaine were available for smuggling to the United States from the coca and cocaine producing countries of South America.

In retrospect it is now estimated that during 1984 as much as 104 tons of cocaine were consumed in the United States which with the 11.7 tons seized would mean about 115.7 tons of cocaine were directed at this country in 1984. For 1985, it is estimated that about 125 tons of cocaine were consumed in the United States which with the 18 tons seized indicated that about 143 tons of cocaine were directed at this country in 1985.

An estimated 25 million people use cocaine in the United States on an occasional or regular basis, 600,000 to 1,200,000 people are thought to be addicted to the substance. The trend, first reported in 1984, that 5,000 people in the United States try cocaine for the first time each day continues. In 1984, the National Institute on Drug Abuse High School Survey reported that 16 percent of the seniors surveyed had used cocaine. In 1985, 17 percent reported using cocaine, 15 percent during the past year and 7 percent during the past month.

There is great concern that many of those high school seniors will go on to use cocaine in the coming years based on records of past classes according to NIDA. For example, while only 10 percent of the class of 1976 had tried cocaine by their senior year, 40 percent of this group had tried it by the time they reached age 27.

The National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) reports that cocaine is one of the most powerfully addictive drugs. In laboratory studies animals given free access to cocaine will take it to the point of death, selecting cocaine in preference to food and water. Treatment professionals estimate that approximately 10 percent of the people who use the drug "recreationally" will go on to serious, heavy use and an individual cannot predict or control the extent to which he or she will use the drug.

It exerts its effect by acting directly on the reward or pleasure controls of the brain. This brain action produces an intense desire to experience the effects of cocaine again and again and accounts for development of compulsive use beyond the control of the user.

A dangerous new development in the cocaine epidemic is the sale of cocaine freebase in ready to smoke rock or chunk form making this highly addictive formulation of the drug available to more people, particularly adolescents. The freebase known as "crack" is sold in small plastic vials usually containing 3 pieces or rocks weighing a total of one quarter gram and selling for $20.00.

Utilizing ether or baking soda the cocaine alkaloid is extracted from or freed from its hydrochloride salt, thus providing the user with a purer, more potent version of the cocaine. It also has a lower volatility than cocaine hydrochloride and can be smoked, while cocaine hydrochloride cannot. Smoking cocaine freebase is dramatically more potent to the user because it is purer to begin with and smoking delivers more rapidly a more powerful level of the alkaloid to the blood stream via the lungs than snorting cocaine. The use of "crack," particularly by young people, including high school and college students is an epidemic in Los Angeles, Miami, and New York City.

In the New York City area it is estimated by treatment professionals that from 5 to 10 percent of regular or addicted users of cocaine are now using heroin in combination with cocaine to tone down the adverse overstimulation cocaine can cause with regular use. Some of these individuals become addicted to heroin.

In 1983 the NIDA-sponsored Drug Abuse Warning Network (DAWN) reported 280 cocaine abuse deaths, whereas in 1984, 604 were reported. In 1983, cocaine abuse resulted in 6,843 hospital emergency episodes, while in 1984, 10,996 were reported.

All of the estimated 143 tons of cocaine, coca base and paste directed at the United States in 1985 with rare exception originated as raw material or in its final form in Peru, Bolivia and Colombia. There is still no commitment by any of those countries to comply with the requirements of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs to limit coca production to legal requirements, to license and control that production and to phase out all other production, eradicating where necessary. Quite to the contrary, coca leaf, coca paste and base and cocaine production is still increasing in all three countries.

Beginning in 1984, evidence was uncovered of efforts by individuals to develop significant coca production in Ecuador, Brazil, Panama and Argentina. The authorities during 1985 made progress in eradicating this production but much more remains to be done, and they need U.S. technical and financial support to prevent their

countries from becoming important illicit producers of coca and cocaine.

Last year this Committee reported on the emergence of clandestine cocaine laboratories in the United States: 6 in 1982; 10 in 1983; 21 in 1984; and 32 in 1985. The Committee has learned that the reasons given for the establishing of cocaine manufacturing laboratories in the United States are: (1) the glut of coca paste in Peru, Bolivia and Colombia since 1982 has resulted in it being offered for sale at very low prices; (2) the chemicals needed to convert coca paste or base to cocaine hydrochloride are easier to obtain in the United States and are far less expensive than in the producer countries; (3) the vastness of the United States enables operators to conceal their laboratories more easily than in South America and they do not have to pay off the police or insurgent groups to operate.

Heroin

From mid-1972 through mid-1974 heroin addiction in the United States was dramatically curtailed with the demise of the Turkish-French connection. From mid-1974 through much of 1976 heroin supplies from Mexico increased, causing a rise in addiction.

The aerial spraying of poppy in Mexico by mid-1976 through 1979 brought about a decrease in the availability and abuse of heroin. By 1979 supplies from Southwest Asia, mostly Pakistan erupted. Lesser quantities of heroin from Mexico and Southeast Asia remained steady and a sharply escalating trend in the traffic and abuse of heroin has continued since then.

There is a consensus by analysts that heroin availability and abuse has risen steadily since 1979. For 1984 in its Annual Report, released on January 3, 1985, the Select Committee reported 500,000 active heroin addicts and users in the United States and the availability of 10 tons of heroin sustain that number of addicts.

For 1985, it is estimated that there were 550,000 active heroin addicts and users in the United States and that 11 tons of heroin were available to create and sustain this pattern of use.

In 1983 the Select Committee reported 12,456 heroin hospital emergency overdose episodes and 1,188 deaths; for 1984, 13,355 hospital emergency overdose episodes and 1,499 deaths were reported to the Committee.

Intravenous heroin use, in addition to the death it causes through overdose, has traditionally caused a high rate of death from disease and accidents related to its use. In 1984 the deaths in the City of New York directly attributed to heroin overdose amounted to 32 percent of the total number of intravenous heroin users who died. The other causes were AIDS, 26 percent; pneumonia, 15 percent; alcohol, 9 percent; all other causes, 18 percent.

The New York State Division of Substance Abuse Services reported in December 1985 that in New York City, intravenous drug use had become a major risk factor in the spread of AIDS, especially when hypodermic needles are shared. Given the fact that the vast majority of heroin addicts use the drug intravenously, many of whom share needles, those individuals are at high risk of contracting AIDS. Of the 4,827 AIDS cases reported in New York City as of October 1985, 1,628, or 34 percent, involved intravenous drug users.

In the past few years the number of reported AIDS cases has been generally increasing. Comparing the first nine months of 1984 with the first nine months of 1985, the number of cases increased 72 percent from 221 to 381. More than half of the AIDS patients in New York City have succumbed to the disease.

In contrast to the rest of the nation, intravenous drug use has had a profound impact on the AIDS situation in New York City. For instance, of pediatric cases of AIDS, 74 percent of the children who have AIDS in New York City have at least one parent who is an intravenous drug user in contrast to 31 percent for the rest of the country. The incidence of AIDS is increasing throughout New York State, with a significant proportion of cases contracted by intravenous drug users.

Deaths due to AIDS among intravenous drug users have increased significantly over the past few years: 88 in 1983; 293 in 1984; and 330 in the first nine months of 1985. If these deaths were added to the deaths classified as deaths due to narcotism discussed earlier, the number of deaths would probably reach an all-time peak for drug users in New York City.

The Committee is informed that most heroin addicts are now regularly or frequently using cocaine in combination with heroin in areas where heroin is available. This is known as "a speedball" or "speedballing" and goes back to the 1920's, the last point in time when heroin and cocaine were readily available. Treatment professionals in the New York area report that about 50 percent of the heroin addicts are now using it in combination with cocaine.

Using cocaine with heroin has a tendency to reduce the number of heroin overdose episodes because of cocaine's stimulant effect. This allegedly also reduces the number of heroin overdose deaths and hospital emergency room episodes.

While the percentage of heroin entering the United States from the three areas of production varies by a few percentage points each year or during the course of the year, indicators coming to the attention of this Committee reveal that the percentage breakdown for the three areas has remained essentially the same as 1984. The overall volume has significantly increased and each area has managed to maintain its share of the market.

About 50 percent of the heroin entering the United States originates in the Near East-South Asia region, principally Pakistan, followed by India, Sri Lanka, Turkey, Syria and Lebanon. The opium raw material for this heroin originates from illicit production in Pakistan and Afghanistan for the most part, but also in Iran and Turkey. India is utilized as a base from which to smuggle heroin of Pakistani origin to Western Europe, the United States and Canada. Indian, Sri Lankan and Nigerian nationals are frequently used as couriers.

The fact that India, particularly new Delhi and Bombay have become important transit centers for the international heroin traffic raises concern that international traffickers may begin to divert significant quantities of legally produced Indian opium to illicit heroin manufacture. An example of the magnitude of the illicit manufacture and traffic of heroin in South Asia was the January 1986 seizure of 615.5 kilos of heroin by Indian authorities in a village 93 miles from Bombay where it was being stored. This is the

largest seizure of record ever made. It is believed to have come to India from Pakistan. Previously the largest seizure of record was 432 kilos of heroin seized aboard a shrimp trawler at Marseilles in 1972 about to depart for Miami.

About 30 percent of the heroin affecting the United States originates in Mexico where since late 1982 the quality and quantity of the heroin has increased sharply and the trend has persisted.

The remaining 20 percent of the heroin traffic to the United States comes from Thailand, Malaysia and Hong Kong, where it is produced from opiate raw materials originating in Burma, Thailand and possibly Laos.

During FY 1985 the 12-month period between October 1, 1984, and September 30, 1985, Federal authorities seized 446.6 kilos of heroin, as compared to 349.2 kilos seized during the same period in 1984.

This is the fifth largest 12-month heroin seizure total on record. Another indicator of expansion in the heroin traffic was a seizure by Customs at Seattle in June 1985 of 95 kilos of heroin two individuals were attempting to smuggle from Bangkok concealed in ice buckets. This was the largest heroin seizure in the United States since 1974. Reportedly the organization responsible for this was successful in bringing in two similar shipments earlier in 1985.

Marijuana

On the basis of the indicators coming to its attention the Select Committee estimated that between 30,000 to 60,000 tons of marijuana is being smuggled to the United States annually. This is being augmented by an estimated 4,000 tons of illicit domestic cultivation.

For 1984, this Committee reported that about 70 percent of the marijuana entering the United States originated in Colombia; 15 percent in Mexico; 7 percent in Jamaica; 5 percent in Belize and 3 percent in all other foreign sources. Domestic production amounts to an additional 13 percent of that total.

For 1985 there is reason to believe Mexico captured a larger share of the market. Estimates are that Colombia supplied 60 percent; Mexico, 25 percent; Jamaica, 7 percent; Belize, 5 percent; and all other foreign sources, 3 percent.

In 1980 only two States reported a significant marijuana cultivation problem. In 1985, all States reported significant cultivation and programs in concert with the DEA to eradicate this production.

It is estimated that 25 million people in the United States regularly use marijuana and as many as 40 million may be occasional users. The 1985 survey involving 16,000 high school seniors conducted by the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research for the National Institute on Drug Abuse reported that marijuana remains the most widely used illicit drug among high school seniors with 54 percent reporting they had used it at least once, 41 percent during the past year, 26 percent in the past month, and 5 percent reporting daily use.

Hashish

The estimated level of hashish smuggling to the United States remained at about 200 tons with trafficking and abuse patterns within the country showing no significant change. It is estimated that 60 percent of the hashish entering the country originates in Pakistan and Afghanistan; 30 percent in Lebanon; 5 percent from Morocco; and 5 percent from all other sources.

Psychotropic drugs

During 1985 in addition to the traffic and abuse of the three basic natural narcotic substances—cocaine, heroin and marijuana—there was a continuing widespread and heavy illicit manufacture, traffic and abuse in the United States of the psychotropic drugs: PCP, methamphetamine, and LSD. In 1985 it is estimated that 7 million people abused the various stimulants, depressants or hallucinogenic forms of the psychotropic substances.

In point of requiring hospital emergency treatment for users and reported deaths, PCP was the leader in 1984, the most recent year for which statistics are available. It was followed by methamphetamine, amphetamine, methaqualone and LSD.

There has been a sharp rise in the illicit manufacture, traffic and abuse of methamphetamine throughout much of the country during 1984 and 1985, but particularly in Texas and Southern California. In 1983, 122 illicit laboratories were seized; in 1984, 106; and in 1985, 206. Dosage units seized in 1983 were 3.9 million; in 1984, 9.7 million; and in 1985, 16.4 million.

Before 1983, 85 percent of the methaqualone trafficked in the United States was smuggled in from abroad, 10 percent was diverted from supplies legally manufactured in the United States and 5 percent was produced in clandestine laboratories in the United States.

Legal domestic manufacture ceased in November 1982, and since then 95 percent of the supply has been smuggled from abroad and 5 percent continues to be illicitly produced domestically. Cooperative diplomatic action abroad has dramatically curtailed the availability of the essential chemicals for the illicit manufacture of methaqualone and also tightened controls to prevent diversion of legal manufacture and stocks. This has resulted in reducing the availability of methaqualone in the United States by an estimated 75 percent in 1984 from what it was in 1981.

The Committee is informed that the combining of alcohol with narcotic and psychotropic drugs as well as with other medicines and chemical substances on an annual basis between 1983 and 1985 has resulted in from 25,000 to 30,000 hospital emergency treatments and between 900 and 1,000 deaths. The most commonly encountered controlled substances found in combination with alcohol requiring emergency treatment were: (1) diazepam; (2) barbiturates; (3) marijuana; and (4) heroin. Deaths occurrred as follows: (1) heroin; (2) barbiturates; (3) diazepam; and (4) codeine. Obviously combining any depressant substance with alcohol which is a depressant is far more lethal than combining alcohol with non-depressant substances.

During the same period, methaqualone related deaths declined from 165 in 1981 to 11 in 1984.

PCP by all reports is of illicit domestic manufacture, as is the bulk of amphetamine and methamphetamine. However, amphetamine is also illicitly produced in substantial quantities in Mexico for smuggling to the United States and methamphetamine is occasionally smuggled in from Canada.

LSD is of illegal domestic manufacture and is also smuggled in from Western Europe. Although much less in volume, psilocybin, mescalin and liquid cannabis are illicitly manufactured, trafficked and abused in the United States. Liquid cannabis is also smuggled from the hashish producing countries.

The total number of illicit narcotic and psychotropic laboratories seized in the United States continues to steadily rise on an annual basis from 183 in 1981 to 334 in 1985.

Diazepam is the most widely prescribed depressant-tranquilizer used in medicine and is the most widely abused psychotropic substance. It is increasingly found as the primary ingredient in counterfeit methaqualone tablets.

An illicit traffic in diazepam has developed in recent years supplied through over-prescribing, diversion and smuggling from abroad. Canada is the primary source of diazepam smuggled to the United States. There is no record of any clandestine diazepam laboratories being seized in this country. Diazepam ranks fifth among all abused controlled substances. However, about 80 percent of all diazepam mentions in recent years have been in combination with other psychoactive substances, particularly alcohol.

1984 Reported Drug Abuse Deaths

1. Heroin	1,499
2. Cocaine	604
3. Barbiturates	452
4. Diazepam	279
5. PCP	226
6. Methamphetamine	81
7. Methaqualone	11
8. Amphetamine	59
9. LSD	1
Total	3,212

1984 Reported Drug Abuse Hospital Emergencies

1. Heroin	13,355
2. Cocaine	10,996
3. Diazepam	9,042
4. PCP	6,242
5. Marijuana	4,489
6. Barbiturate/sedatives	3,927
7. Methamphetamine	1,948
8. Amphetamine	974
Total	50,973

DOMESTIC ILLICIT NARCOTIC AND PSYCHOTROPIC DRUG LABORATORY SEIZURES

	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985
Methamphetamine	89	132	122	106	206
PCP	35	47	47	12	21

DOMESTIC ILLICIT NARCOTIC AND PSYCHOTROPIC DRUG LABORATORY SEIZURES—Continued

	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985
Amphetamine	14	18	25	14	43
Methaqualone	13	7	11	3	5
PCE	0	1	1	1	0
P2P	0	6	7	7	21
PHP	0	0	2	0	0
DMT	0	1	1	0	0
MDA	0	3	5	0	3
Psilocybin	0	0	2	1	1
LSD	4	0	0	0	0
Mescaline	1	2	0	0	0
Cocaine	5	6	10	21	32
Heroin	0	0	2	2	0
Methadone	0	1	1	0	0
Hashish oil	0	0	4	1	0
Other hallucinogens	10	0	0	0	0
All others	12	0	0	0	2
Total	183	224	240	168	334

Conclusions

For a decade the United States has underestimated the threat that the illicit production and traffic of narcotic and psychotropic drugs poses to its public health and national security. It has failed to recognize lessons of history which teach that once entrenched unless confronted the traffic and usage of narcotic drugs increases and spreads.

Succeeding administrations have failed to assign the attention, priority and resources necessary to bring drug trafficking and abuse under control and eventually reduce it to an irreducible minimum.

These administrations all recognized that illicit drug production had to be eradicated and illicit manufacturing smuggling and trafficking had to be suppressed as the way to restrict drug availability and usage. They also recognized the need to inform and educate people of all ages of the dangers of using drugs and to provide treatment to the victims of drug abuse. Indicators and statistics since 1979 on all drugs of abuse except methaqualone reveal that each year our efforts failed more than the previous year. Each year the availability of drugs significantly increased. While NIDA's high school senior and household surveys indicate that use of many drugs (but not cocaine) has declined or stabilized, the Select Committee believes that drug use has been increasing, based on testimony we have received as well as other indicators of drug usage and availability. Virtually all experts agree, however, that drug use in this country is at intolerably high levels.

The basic strategy of restricting drug availability and educating people not to use drugs failed because the resources asssigned to it as well as the priority and leadership by the Federal Government was hopelessly insufficient to meet the constantly increasing availability of narcotic and psychotropic drugs across the country and to prevent the misguided tendency of massive numbers of our population to experiment with and fall victim to these drugs.

Against this illicit business which will gross $130 billion in sales in 1986 and will cost another $100 billion in social and economic losses, the Federal Government will spend an estimated $2 billion in 1986, while $280 billion is provided for military defense. For 1987 about $320 billion is being requested for military defense and approximately $2–$2.2 billion to defend the nation from the traffic and abuse of narcotic drugs.

Recommendations

Air interdiction

1. The bulk of the estimated 150 tons of cocaine that will enter the United States during 1986 will come in via small, relatively slow flying aircraft at low altitude to evade our military air detection radar positioned to detect high altitude, high speed, large aircraft. Much of the marijuana smuggled into the United States is also brought in by air and from Colombia and Jamaica by large, older commercial aircraft such as the DC–3, D–4 and DC–6. They penetrate deep into all regions of the country to deliver multi-ton loads of marijuana. This trafficking method has gone on for at least a decade and has exposed an astonishing window of vulnerability in our air defense system. Would-be enemies could use similar aircraft to bomb this nation, deliver terrorist and underground insurgents for terrorism and sabotage activity against our population and infrastructure.

Testimony taken by this Committee during 1985 indicates that the cost to close this glaring vulnerability in our national defense system would be $10 billion. Closing this gap in our air defense system would also provide an effective defense against air smuggling, an important secondary dividend making it doubly worthwhile. This Committee therefore recommends that Congress consider appropriate measures to complete our air defense radar network against low flying aircraft.

The U.S. Coast Guard

2. At this point in time under Gramm-Rudman-Hollings the Coast Guard is facing budgetary reductions which will reduce and curtail its ability to meet its overall mission responsibilities. While this Committee would be expected to urge that cuts not be made in the Coast Guard's narcotics enforcement programs at the expense of other programs it cannot do so. The interest of the nation demands that no Coast Guard programs be reduced. None are frivolous or wasteful or unnecessary. All are vital to the maritime safety of the nation, our national defense and the protection of our coasts from drug and alien smuggling. This committee believes strengthening the military readiness of the Coast Guard for its national defense role in time of war or national emergency is totally compatible with strengthening its ability to prevent drug smuggling across our coastlines.

It is recommended that for FY 1987 through 1989 the overall Coast Guard budget be increased to bring the Coast Guard to a posture where it can substantially increase its effectiveness in preventing drug smuggling across our coastlines while simultaneously increasing its readiness in time of military need.

Customs drug interdiction programs

3. This Committee believes the results of the Customs air and marine interdiction programs have not been equal to the high cost of equipment procurement and operational costs needed to implement the programs. The lack of the type of radar coverage called for in recommendation No. 1 is primarily responsible for the lack of success in air interdiction. As to marine interdiction in U.S. territorial waters, Customs does not have the marine capability to be effective on its own. Customs has tried in some areas, particularly Florida, to enlist the marine capability of state and local police services in cooperative anti-drug smuggling efforts, but much more needs to be done in this area. The Committee also believes that strategic planning on marine interdiction and its tactical application in U.S. territorial waters by Customs and Coast Guard leaves much to be desired in effectively sharing their joint jurisdiction in this area.

While funds for expensive air and marine interdiction programs have increased during the past 4 years, Customs has each year made budget requests which included reductions from 200 to 1,000 positions in its force of inspectors and patrol officers, notwithstanding the fact that the bulk of all its drug seizures were made by these two elements of the service, particularly the inspectors. Each year Congress rejected these cuts and one year actually increased the number of positions.

During 1985 this Committee became greatly concerned with what it perceives as drug smugglers penetrating Customs inspection and control systems at several international airports, to smuggle in the bulk of the heroin and more than half of the cocaine entering the country. Increasing trends of heroin smuggling are reported at JFK airport, New York, and at the Los Angeles, San Francisco, Honolulu and Seattle airports. Cocaine in record quantities entered at Miami through schemes that circumvented air baggage and air cargo Customs inspection controls.

At a time when Customs should have been increasing its inspection manpower and strengthening its patrol force to ensure the security of the Customs control area at international airports, it was requesting cutbacks in these positions from a level which even then was less than sufficient.

Simultaneously, Customs about 1979 began to adopt inspection procedures at airports and seaports designed to expedite the movement of passengers and cargo to increase and encourage trade and travel. This could only be done by hiring more inspectors or by abbreviating the inspection procedures and using the same or even lesser numbers of inspectors. While Customs maintains that the use of automation, roving inspectors, improved profiles and other techniques has increased the efficiency and efficacy of Customs inspections, this committee finds ample evidence that these inspection procedures are not working. For example, in June 1985, Customs seized 95 kilos of heroin in Seattle that two individuals were attempting to smuggle in from Bangkok concealed in ice buckets. This was the largest heroin seizure in the United States since 1974. Follow-up investigation of the organization responsible for this shipment determined that during the 18 month period between

January 1984 and June 1985, using the same modus operandi, this group successfully smuggled in 1,500 kilos (1.5 tons) of heroin.

Another smuggling scheme at Miami International Airport resulted in a penetration of the Customs inspection control system for about one year prior to August 1985 when it was discovered through independent information. This breakdown permitted cocaine shipments from Colombia averaging about 400 kilos each, contained in baggage on airline flights, to evade detection. Three to four shipments per week were made, and it is estimated that from 63 to 84 tons of cocaine entered the country during the year this scheme was in operation. This was the most successful narcotic smuggling operation ever carried out and took advantage of the manpower weakness of the Customs inspection and patrol force at the Miami International Airport.

Notwithstanding the fact that the inspection control system is being heavily penetrated, it still seizes the bulk of the cocaine and heroin seized by Customs. This Committee is convinced the lack of manpower to properly screen the increasing movement of passengers and cargo has been responsible for this breakdown.

A. Customs at airports and seaports must emphasize and recommit its inspection force to its traditional and often mundane work of inspecting passengers and cargo, opening vessel containers, inspecting importers' warehouses and arriving passengers and their baggage as well as ensuring the Customs control areas of airports and seaports are secure from schemes that enable baggage and cargo containing narcotic drug shipments to circumvent inspection. There is no substitute for these measures if narcotics smuggling by passengers and in cargo is to be effectively prevented.

B. Inspection procedures at our Mexican and Canadian border entry ports also have to be increased and re-intensified. About 35 percent of both the heroin and cocaine entering the United States comes across the Mexican border—much of it through the ports of entry concealed in motor vehicles, baggage and cargo and on the person of smugglers. A balance must be worked out between the need to rapidly move people and cargo across those borders and the need to inspect to prevent drug smuggling.

C. This Committee recommends that the U.S. Customs Service be provided an appropriation sufficient to significantly increase the number of inspector positions and that the clerical and administrative support staffs for the inspection force be commensurately increased. The Committee believes an increase in the inspection force of at least 25 percent over 2-3 years would be appropriate and urges Congress to consider such an increase.

D. While the Committee believes the Customs air interdiction program has not been effective as stated previously, it believes the fault lies with the lack of military type air defense radar to detect smuggling aircraft. This Committee commends the Customs Service for its ambitious air interdiction efforts. It has recognized the need to protect our coasts and borders from this constant drug smuggling assault from abroad. There is a perception that Customs has been left on its own in this endeavor and again this Committee congratulates Customs for its initiative and resourcefulness in organizing and implementing a program that has brought some major narcotic arrests and seizures. Notwithstanding, the Customs

65-444 O - 86 - 2

air interdiction program in scope and strength is not sufficient to effectively prevent the air smuggling of drugs. In addition to the need for a system of air search radar to spot aerial smugglers seeking to penetrate our coasts and borders, the Customs air interdiction role must be integrated and coordinated with the U.S. Coast Guard air program and the U.S. Navy aerial patrol squadrons if the United States is to be effectively defended against the air smuggling of narcotic drugs.

E. As a means to deter air smuggling the Committee recommends legislation that would make it a felony for a pilot to take an aircraft out of United States without filing a flight plan and to return without having filed a flight plan. Failure to comply would also result in seizure and forfeiture of the aircraft. This legislation should also provide that an aircraft entering the United States from abroad must as a first step land at an airport where it can be inspected and cleared by Customs. Failure to comply would result in a felony charge against the pilot and seizure and forfeiture of the aircraft.

F. Under Article 35 of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961 the United States Government should arrange with all neighboring countries for their drug enforcement services to have coordinated programs of "hot pursuit" to prevent air smugglers, particularly, but also marine smugglers from eluding arrest by escaping to another territory of jurisdiction.

Federal drug enforcement

4. The illicit production abroad of opium, heroin, coca, cocaine, marijuana and hashish for trafficking to the United States and the other industrial democracies is increasing in all the producer countries. Increasing quantities are entering the United States and are being trafficked across the length and breadth of the nation.

This Committee has taken testimony indicating that the Drug Enforcement Administration and the United States Attorneys' Offices throughout the country have stretched their resources to the ultimate and are incapable of doing any more in the way of seizing more drugs, arresting more violators and developing more prosecutions, convictions and incarcerations. Notwithstanding the fact their efforts are highly successful and productive, they report we are losing the drug war. The volume and availability of drugs are increasing; the purity is up; and the price is down or stable. For every one prosecution they initiate, they indicate there may be ten they cannot exploit because of lack of resources. They select out the most important violators for investigation leaving untold numbers of important violators and organizations relatively free to operate.

PCP, designer drugs, "crack"—the new highly addictive form of cocaine—and high potency Mexican black tar heroin have now emerged to explosively expand the trafficking and abuse patterns of drugs. In 1985 alone a number of indicators pointed to a dramatic increase in the illicit manufacture, traffic and abuse of methamphetamine, long known as speed. Domestic marijuana production shows no sign of abating and requires more vigorous eradication. Marijuana growers were discovered growing small quantities of opium poppy in Vermont, Washington, Michigan and California in

1985. The clandestine manufacture of cocaine is annually entrenching itself more and more in the United States.

Unless the ability of both the Federal and State and local narcotics enforcement units and criminal justice systems are substantially increased, the problem of illicit narcotic smuggling, manufacture and traffic which is now out of control will move further out of control and pose an ever increasing threat to the public health, domestic tranquility and national security of the United States.

A. The special agent manpower of the Drug Enforcement Administration should be increased from its 1986 levels of about 2,500 to 3,500 as soon as possible, but not later than by the close of FY 88. Administrative and clerical personnel sufficient to support the increased special agent force as well as commensurate increases for operation funding and the purchase of evidence and payment of rewards should also be provided. DEA special agents are dedicated to drug enforcement full time and are trained to handle every facet of narcotic investigation involving illicit production, manufacture, trafficking, smuggling and international operations.

B. To more effectively process the increasing number of important narcotic prosecutions and asset forfeitures the DEA with its substantial increase in manpower would begin to refer to the United States Attorneys' Offices and the Federal Courts, the number of Assistant U.S. Attorneys and U.S. District Court Judges should be increased correspondingly along with their clerical and administrative support services. The resources of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons should also be increased appropriately to provide increased prison capacity to accommodate the additional number of narcotic offenders that will be convicted and imprisoned. The number of deputy U.S. Marshals should also be increased to handle the anticipated increase in Federal narcotic violator defendants. The criminal justice increases should be provided for by the Department of Justice over a 2-3 year period.

State and local drug enforcement

The Federal Government has failed through diplomacy and narcotics control assistance programs on its own or through the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control to curtail the illicit production and traffic of narcotic drugs abroad directed to the United States. It has also failed to intercept sufficient quantities of the drugs entering the country and to prosecute and incarcerate sufficient numbers of smugglers to meaningfully curtail and deter this activity. Further it has failed to effectively suppress the interstate distribution of narcotics and psychotropic drugs throughout the country whether produced at home or abroad. The result of all of this has been that during the past decade the wholesale and retail availability, sale and abuse of narcotic drugs has blanketed the nation and is found in every city, town and community.

5. In hearings throughout the country beginning in 1983 and continuing to date this Committee has learned that the state and local narcotics enforcement services, prosecutors offices, courts and prisons have become gridlocked with the number of narcotics prosecutions and by violent and petty crime related to drug trafficking and abuse.

States and localities cannot negotiate the curtailment of narcotic production abroad, prevent their smuggling to the United States and their interstate distribution into their communities. These are Federal responsibilities. The Federal Government should recognize that with its failure to prevent the flood of narcotic and psychotropic drugs so adversely affecting States and localities, it has an obligation to assist them in coping with this tragic situation. About $115–$120 million is provided by the Federal Government to the states annually to prevent and treat drug abuse, and about $24 million is provided for state and local police to participate in joint drug enforcement task force with DEA. This assistance is very helpful, but falls far short of what should be provided by the Federal Government to help the states cope with a problem essentially brought on by a Federal failure.

In January 1985 Chairman Rangel and Ranking Minority Member Gilman cosponsored H.R. 526, "The State and Local Narcotics Control Assistance Act of 1985." The bill would provide $750 million annually for fiscal years 1986 through 1990, broken down into 6 categories funded at $125 million each, where states and local communities need help. The bill:

1. provides for additional personnel, equipment, facilities, training, and supplies to State and local narcotics enforcement units for more widespread apprehension of drug criminals;
2. provides for similar support to increase the number of state and county attorneys, their support staffs and facilities for the prosecution of narcotics cases in State courts;
3. provides for an increased number of judges, support staffs and courtrooms in the State court system to increase the number of narcotics cases that can be adjudicated and reduce delays that often leave drug peddlers free to ply their trade pending trial;
4. provides for increasing the capacity of State correctional facilities to hold convicted drug felons and providing support to establish and improve drug treatment and rehabilitation services to inmates with a history of drug dependency;
5. provides for increased support for States to eradicate illicit marijuana and opium poppy cultivation; and
6. authorizes the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide $125 million annually for the same 5-year period to States to increase the availability of drug abuse prevention, education, treatment, and rehabilitation programs.

This Committee believes that this type assistance by the Federal Government to the State and local communities is necessary if they are to cope effectively with drug trafficking and abuse. In 1987 this would amount to only $750 million to help our state and local communities defend their homes and families from the drug trafficking attack being directed at them from abroad; $750 million is reasonable when in 1987 we may appropriate $320 billion for our military defense.

Drug abuse prevention and treatment

6. The Department of Health and Human Services should utilize the resources of the American media and education systems to present the medical and scientific evidence that is available to con-

vince people that narcotic and psychotropic drugs used experimentally, or for any non-medical purpose, entails serious risks of dependency problems destructive to personal and family well-being and work patterns, can be life threatening and can cause serious long and short term health problems.

As a start the average annual Federal funding of $20 million for drug abuse education should be at least doubled. This Committee would support further increases if the Administration and/or the experts in drug abuse education and prevention can justify additional expenditures for this important work. Any additional sums in the judgment of this Committee should be concentrated on media based information programs that will reach out to the entire propulation of the United States at risk to drug abuse. These programs should range from dissuading young people from trying drugs to persuading experimenters and occasional users and the heavily dependent to seek counseling or treatment for their problem.

7. In hearings held at New York, Chicago, Boston and Washington, D.C., witnesses testified as to the need, given the prolific availability of drugs in our society, to begin educating our children about the dangers of drug use at an early age. Many experts called for mandatory drug abuse prevention education curricula in grades K through 12 throughout the 50 states. They also felt that the Federal Government should support such an effort by providing funding, coordination, research guidance, and technical assistance to help the individual states achieve the most effective programs.

This Committee believes that given the failure of the Federal Government to prevent the widespread availability of narcotic and psychotropic drugs throughout the nation, the Federal Government has a responsibility to lead and support the states in educating our children not to use narcotic and psychotropic drugs other than for medical purposes as prescribed by a physician.

8. Currently the Department of Health and Human Services, though the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Services Block Grant, provides about $115–120 million annually to the states for drug abuse treatment and prevention. This amount should be progressively increased on an annual basis notwithstanding what may be provided in this area by H.R. 526. There is a critical need for the Federal Government to support treatment programs for the unfortunate victims of drug abuse that need and are seeking treatment, but do not have the financial means to obtain it. Treatment reduces the demand for drugs by taking the buyer away from the seller and reduces demand further by taking the drug users out of circulation preventing them from inducing others to try drugs which is how drug use is spread. H.R. 526 is an attempt to respond to a drug treatment emergency created by increasing need for services coupled with declining Federal support, but there is a strong need to build a stable and expanding base of Federal support for drug abuse treatment through the block grant mechanism.

9. This Committee, on the basis of what it has learned in hearings across the country, has the perception that as an unintended spinoff of the block grant system of Federal assistance to the States that began in 1982 for drug abuse treatment and prevention programs, the Federal presence in the field to support the states ef-

forts has been diminished. Also important data from the state programs to enable the Federal government to measure, analyze and evaluate the drug abuse situation on an ongoing basis throughout the country is not now provided. This is because the block grant system did not mandate it. This Committee regards NIDA as the best repository of information and knowledge on drug abuse prevention and treatment in the world. It regards the U.S. Public Health Service as the most experienced and highly competent professional service in the world in the art and practice of treating drug abuse.

A. The Secretary of Health and Human Services should take the necessary steps to ensure that every state or regional area of the United States has a field office of the U.S. Public Health Service to represent NIDA and to assist the State and local prevention and treatment services in carrying out their work with the full benefit of Federal research, technical assistance and funding. The U.S. Public Health Service (USPHS) field offices could also assist in collecting data and information on a timely basis to assess drug abuse trends.

B. In concert with NIDA, the USPHS should develop a "National Drug Abuse Prevention and Treatment Strategy" jointly with the states and territories. It should provide for a comprehensive program for implementation in partnership with the states. The Federal Government's role in accordance with its obligations under the Single Convention of 1961 and the Psychotropic Convention of 1971 would be to provide funding, leadership, direction and coordination to ensure that the national objective to effectively prevent and treat drug abuse is achieved.

International narcotics control

10. Set forth above are a series of recommendations that urge the Administration to substantially increase the equipment and manpower needed to defend our nation from narcotics smuggling and trafficking and to prevent and treat drug abuse. These measures will entail major increases in funding over a period of years if they are to be successful. Also they will have to be continued at a high level of intensity without letup until such time as the uncontrolled illicit production and traffic of narcotic drugs abroad responsible for the traffic assaulting the United States is brought under control.

The narcotic drugs trafficked and abused throughout most of the world affecting over one hundred countries, including the United States, originates in about fourteen. All of them are parties to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961 and have a solemn obligation to eradicate illicit cultivation and suppress the illicit manufacture and trafficking of drugs arising from the illicit cultivation in their territory.

If need be, they can seek help from the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC) or from the United States or other Governments willing to aid with financial and technical assistance.

Eradication is the responsibility of the illegal producers. Drug use is created and sustained by their production. From 1912 to 1972, 12 international narcotic and psychotropic conventions were designed to limit drugs to medical purposes by keeping drugs from

the abuser. They concede that, if available, they will be abused by large segments of the populations, even when the practice is not acceptable to society.

No long term meaningful reduction in the traffic and abuse of narcotic drugs has ever been achieved in the face of unlimited supplies of illicitly produced narcotic raw materials as currently exists.

A. This Committee recommends the Department of State determine why the implementation of its strategy, which through diplomatic negotiations and cooperative financial and technical assistance support has succeeded in the past in controlling illicit production and trafficking, is now failing.

B. This Committee recommends that with the major drug producing countries the issue of their failure to gradually eliminate narcotic production and trafficking be made the number one priority in our relationship with them. In addition to social and economic problems their narcotic control failures create in the United States, the illicit production and traffic in their own countries is threatening in many instances their very ability to survive in addition to the severe social and economic disruption rampant drug production, trafficking and abuse is causing within their own countries.

Only by persuading and assisting in bringing drug production and trafficking under control can we for much longer continue to count on most of the drug producing nations as reliable friends, allies and trading partners. In most major drug producing countries, particularly Latin America, the key to solving their severe economic, political and social problems is bringing the production and traffic of narcotics under control.

C. This Committee recommends that the Department of State expand and intensify its diplomatic initiatives with the drug producing countries that are allies or at least friendly to the United States to bring drug production and trafficking under control with our assistance, with the help of other friendly countries and the United Nations. A special effort should be made to have the western industrial democracies and the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC) act in concert with the State Department to negotiate narcotic assistance programs in the drug producing countries friendly to the United States and the other industrial democracies. Also with its allies, the United States should urge the United Nations narcotics control bodies to negotiate and implement programs with those producer countries generally thought to be unfriendly to the industrial democracies to bring narcotic production and trafficking under control.

COLOMBIA

About 75 percent of the cocaine entering the United States continues to be clandestinely manufactured in Colombia from coca paste smuggled from Peru and Bolivia where it is converted from coca leaves produced in these countries. Since 1981, drug trafficking organizations in Colombia have brought on line their own coca leaf and coca paste industry to augment the raw material supply from Peru and Bolivia. It is estimated that Peru and Bolivia each supply about 40 percent of the total coca paste processed in Colom-

bia, with the remaining 20 percent now coming from domestic coca leaf production.

The clandestine production of marijuana in Colombia, notwithstanding a start at herbicide spray eradication, continues to be responsible for about 60 percent of the marijuana entering the United States.

Following the assassination of Justice Minister Rodrigo Lara Bonilla, Colombia, beginning in March 1984, finally mounted an aggressive campaign that seized 47 cocaine laboratories, and about 14 tons of cocaine and coca paste, resulting in 1,425 arrests through August 1, 1984. Most arrestees were released due to insufficient evidence, a chronic problem of Colombian drug enforcement. The continuing inability or unwillingness of the Colombian Government to effectively prosecute the vast majority of illicit cocaine manufacturers and traffickers whom they arrest in flagrant violation of their narcotic laws is primarily responsible for the illicit manufacturing and trafficking of cocaine and production and traffic of marijuana moving out of control in the country during the past decade.

No commitment has been received from Colombia to eradicate the illicit production of marijuana and coca leaf. There has been a token program to manually eradicate marijuana for a number of years, but it has been inadequate and production has continued to increase.

During 1984 Colombian authorities report that, of the 44,000 hectares of marijuana cultivated, about 1,500 hectares were destroyed manually. During July 1984, the Colombian Government began testing the aerial spraying of marijuana with the herbicidal glyphosate. This was followed by an operational program where about 3,000 hectares were eradicated before the 1984 crop was harvested. During the first 7 months of 1985 only 2,500 hectares have been eradicated by herbicides.

Prior to 1980 significant coca production did not exist in Colombia, but by then Colombian criminal organizations had developed and rapidly expanded coca leaf production in the southern departments of Cauca, Putumayo and Narino and the eastern plains departments of Meta and Vaupes. As with marijuana cultivation, a token manual eradication program has been carried out which has been ineffective and coca leaf production continues to expand in Colombia and is now thought to total about 25,000 hectares compared to 15,000 hectares in 1983. The State Department is assisting the Colombian authorities to find a herbicide which will be effective in eradicating coca without causing adverse environmental effects. These efforts have been underway since 1982 and it is disappointing that, given the advanced state of herbicide technology, a suitable chemical cannot be agreed upon, particularly when coca cultivation in Colombia is increasing at about 25 percent annually.

What is of concern is that over the fifteen-month period that the reported increased enforcement activity has taken place in Colombia, beginning in April 1984, there has been no diminution in the availability of cocaine and marijuana of Colombian origin on our streets. Further, there has been no sign of any decrease in the smuggling of cocaine and marijuana to the United States from Colombia.

The failure of the Colombian Government to close down the clandestine airfields and docking sites used to load aircraft and vessels particularly along the north coast with marijuana and cocaine for smuggling to the United States, continues to be disappointing. This activity, if anything, seems to be tolerated by the Government of Colombia. It has never been seriously addressed, yet it is a choke point where aggressive enforcement could dramatically curtail drug smuggling to the United States.

Given the quantities of cocaine and coca paste and the number of laboratory facilities that have been reported seized, it is very difficult to understand how the cocaine being smuggled from Colombia to the United States is undiminished if it is not in fact continuing to increase. We also note that during the same period, seizures of cocaine coming from Colombia have been of record high levels in West European countries.

It is thought that until such time as the uncontrolled production of the coca leaf in Peru, Bolivia and Colombia is brought under control, we are not likely to see any decrease in the illicit manufacture and traffic of cocaine directed to the United States.

Past experience indicates that only by substantially eliminating narcotic raw materials have we been successful in dramatically, and over the long term, reducing the availability of heroin and cocaine. Unfortunately, in Peru, Bolivia and Colombia, coca leaf production is still increasing and there is no structured program in any of the three to progressively eliminate it.

When President Betancur met with President Reagan in December 1982, they had agreed that the drug problem was serious and that it must be attacked at the root and that they had asked Secretary of State Shultz and Foreign Minister Lloreda to work out a comprehensive, full plan of attack. This has not been done. The Select Committee supports this proposal and has been urging that "the United States in its narcotic control assistance to the Government of Colombia must develop an orderly, comprehensive approach to identify with that government what is needed to be jointly accomplished and how to go about doing it." This has been lacking in U.S. Government narcotic control assistance to Colombia which goes back more than ten years, yet during that period of time and to date the drug problem has gotten progressively worse.

Recommendations

1. To implement the development of a full and comprehensive plan to bring the illicit production and traffic of marijuana, coca and cocaine under control in Colombia, the State Department should organize a small expert committee that would cooperate with a counterpart group organized by the Government of Colombia.

2. The joint committee of experts would assist Colombia to find a way to develop and implement a comprehensive program that would enable it to eradicate the illicit cultivation of marijuana and coca; to curtail the smuggling of coca paste and base from Bolivia and Peru; to effectively detect and seize the illicit processing facilities used to produce coca paste and cocaine; to suppress the internal and export traffic of these substances; to immobilize the clandestine docking sites and airstrips in the north coast region used to

load vessels and aircraft smuggling marijuana and cocaine internationally; to expand and intensify its ability to arrest, convict, and incarcerate drug traffickers, particularly the major violators and financiers; and to cooperate more effectively with the narcotic enforcement agencies abroad of countries being affected by drug smuggling from Colombia.

3. If Colombia commits itself to the massive comprehensive multi-faceted program that is required to bring the production and traffic of narcotics under control, the United States must then substantially increase its programs of training, equipment and materiel assistance to Colombia. There is every reason to believe that Canada and Western European countries also seriously affected by the traffic in narcotics from Colombia would join the United States in assisting Colombia. The United Nations, particularly its Fund For Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC), can also provide valuable assistance if Colombia would offer realistic program opportunities.

ECUADOR

Ecuador is no longer just a drug transshipment state. It has also become a drug producing nation. More than 950 hectares of coca have been eradicated since President Febres Cordero took office in August of 1984. During the past six months fifty coca processing laboratories have been destroyed and 35 tons of ether have been imported to Ecuador. On its August 1985 study mission to South America, the Select Committee delegation was informed that there are approximately 400,000 drug abusers in Ecuador.

There is a consensus that Ecuador has made considerable progress in combatting drug trafficking since the Febres Cordero Administration took office a year ago. An effort to eradicate coca plantations has been undertaken; the President is totally committed to waging "war" against the drug traffickers—the political will to achieve this objective is present, but better equipment, training and other assistance is needed. Manual eradication of coca plants need to be replaced by more effective techniques, such as aerial spraying and bulldozing.

As in the other countries that the Committee visited, Ecuadorian officials realize that the drug problem has gotten out of control and that an international cooperative drug program and commitment to implement that program are urgently needed. In this regard, the Committee delegation urged Ecuadorian officials to increase and intensify cooperation in the Andean region against drug trafficking and abuse.

According to the Ecuadorian officials, drug money laundering activities are being conducted in Ecuador. One source estimates that $2 million to $3 million are deposited in Ecuadorian banks every two weeks and that money laundering activities in Ecuador are increasing.

Ecuadorian law enforcement officials do not have a credible estimate of the extent of the illicit production and trafficking of coca. Again, as in the other South American nations visited by the Committee, better drug intelligence collection and enforcement capabilities are needed, including systematic aerial surveys.

Cooperation between DEA and Ecuador's law enforcement agencies has been characterized as excellent.

President Febres Cordero has appointed an army colonel to be a drug czar to coordinate Ecuador's law enforcement efforts and he has signed a decree establishing a National Program Against Drugs, headed by the Attorney General. Some congressional leaders, however, want the drug czar to be under the control of the Attorney General, who is selected by the Congress.

Cooperation between the Ecuadorian military and the police is strained. The military does not want to be the lead agency in combatting the drug traffickers. There is also a concern that the military would succumb to the corruptive influence of the traffickers.

The National Police is renting helicopters from the army at $1,000 per hour, which is not cost effective. A leasing or purchasing agreement between INM and the military/national police is needed.

The National Directorate for the Control of Illicit Narcotics (DINACTE), which is part of the Attorney General's office, is charged with narcotics enforcement and intelligence gathering responsibilities. The Directorate is regarded as ineffective; it is headed by a psychiatrist and staffed with personnel who do not have narcotics control or law enforcement experience.

Recommendations

1. The U.S. Ambassador at Quito with the assistance of the DEA staff assigned to the Embassy and with such technical support he might need from the Department of State should organize and implement a comprehensive plan of action with the government of Ecuador that would counter with U.S. technical and material support the serious threat of expanding coca and cocaine production and trafficking.

2. Joint Ecuador-Colombia river patrols should be established. The State Department should encourage bilateral river patrols by these nations.

3. The State Department's Bureau of International Narcotics Matters, working in concert with DEA, should examine how better drug intelligence gathering data can be collected regarding the illicit production of coca leaves, including support for systematic aerial surveys by the host country.

4. The State Department's Bureau of International Narcotics Matters, in consultation with DEA, should arrange for a cost effective way of providing the National Police with a helicopter capability for drug eradication and enforcement.

PERU

During its August 1985 study mission to South America, the Select Committee delegation found that since its last visit to Peru in August 1983 the illicit production of coca is estimated to have increased from 55,000 tons annually to 100,000 to 150,000 tons. There are some estimates that it is even higher, 200,000 tons or more.

Peru has developed a program in one of the 6 coca production areas of the country, the Upper Huallaga Valley where since its in-

ception in 1981, 4,000 hectares of coca bush have been eradicated. The rural and agricultural phase of this program known as PEAH has made a good start at developing programs to encourage growers to phase out coca production, notwithstanding narco-terrorist attacks which have assassinated 19 agricultural workers involved in crop substitution, destroying their building installations and equipment. The law enforcement program known as CORAH has also made a commendable start by eradicating 4,000 hectares and destroying a great many coca conversion pits. Notwithstanding coca production and the illicit manufacture of coca paste has continued to expand in the area each year. In the five other major coca producing areas of Peru illicit coca production has also increased dramatically on an annual basis. There is no effort to differentiate licensed legal coca cultivation from illicit and no effort to eradicate illicit cultivation whatsoever or ensure licensed cultivation is not directed to the illicit traffic. Also there is no effort to prevent the constant expansion of illicit coca production and no meaningful effort to suppress illicit coca paste manufacture that proliferates in the growing regions.

Illicit coca paste and base manufacture in Peru and the manufacture of cocaine has continued to expand to keep pace with coca production. No where in the country have the Guardia Civil of PIP kept pace with the increased illicit manufacture of coca paste and cocaine. Additionally, the explosion of a laboratory in Lima exposed the dimensions of the Lopez Rodriguez organization and the extent of their cocaine manufacturing capability. The enormous cocaine manufacturing facilities successfully raided with Colombia Police assistance in August in the Amazon region of the country attests to the impunity traffickers believe they can operate in Peru. The attraction for the operators in the Amazon is the remoteness of the area and availability by air transport of high grade coca paste or base at a reasonable price in unlimited supply in Peru, particularly in the Upper Huallaga Valley.

The Committee delegation has been very favorably impressed by the new administration of President Alan Garcia's reorganization of the Guardia Civil and the PIP and the vigorous steps subsequently taken by the Guardia Civil with the logistical support of the Colombia National Police to raid a series of cocaine laboratories in the Amazon region. As commendable and important as this action is, the Committee delegation remains uneasy that in the statements made by the Peruvion officials with whom they met and in subsequent speeches and news reports, emphasis was on severe action against narcotics traffickers and the users of coca and cocaine as the key to bringing the problem under control.

The Committee did not hear declarations of equal vigor of the need to halt the constant escalation of illicit coca production that began about 1975 and continues unabated. The bulk of this illicit production is not in the hands of traditional growers who have grown modest amounts for chewing and for the limited medical and industrial requirements of coca. The cultivation of coca in Peru is overwhelmingly illicit and is sponsored, subsidized, directed and dominated by ruthless narcotic trafficking organizations.

As long as this cultiviation continues to expand or remain at its current very high level, no meaningful or long term progress will

be possible in suppressing illicit manufacture and reducing the abuse of coca and cocaine in Peru and worldwide. Much more can and should be done in all countries to suppress the illicit manufacture and trafficking in coca and cocaine and to prevent and treat the abuse of coca and cocaine and of all narcotic and psychotropic drugs.

However, experience worldwide during the past 20 years with the illicit manufacture of heroin and cocaine, the two leading illicitly manufactured drugs, reveals the volume of their manufacture is directly related to the volume of the illicit production of their raw materials opium and coca. The volume of the illicit traffic in heroin and cocaine is directly related to the volume of heroin and cocaine illicitly manufactured. The abuse and addiction to heroin and cocaine worldwide is directly related to the volume of the drug available for illicit trafficking. Meaningful progress will not be possible in controlling the worldwide problem of cocaine trafficking and abuse until the illicit cultivation of coca in Peru can be phased out and the modest cultivation for legal requirements brought under a system of licensing and strictly controlled.

The Committee delegation came away from Peru with a perception that the Government recognizes that the enormous volume of coca being illicitly produced in the country is the real cause of the illicit manufacturing and trafficking problem that is threatening the nation. Further that it is struggling to find the means to phase out this production in such a way as to overcome the political and social liabilities that would result if their control plans are not well prepared and effectively implemented. To accomplish this, Peru is going to need the help of the United States, other friendly countries and the United Nations. Peru is also going to need massive technical and material support to organize, train and equip its police, military, criminal justice, agricultural and rural development systems to bring the illicit production and traffic of coca and cocaine under control.

Recommendations

1. This Committee reaffirms the recommendations it made in its annual report for 1984 that "the constantly increasing illicit production and traffic of coca, coca paste and cocaine is steadily undermining the ability of democracy to survive in Peru." A realistic recognition of the depth of the problem and a broader, more comprehensive program of support and assistance by the United States is needed to bring the production and traffic of coca and cocaine under control and to save democracy."

2. The Department of State should organize a small expert committee that would cooperate with a counterpart group organized by the Government of Peru. The joint expert committee should prepare a plan and provide for its implementation to bring the illicit production and traffic of coca under control with U.S. Government assistance, and that of other concerned countries and the United Nations. The plan should:

A. Establish the quantity of coca leaf that is required in Peru to meet its own current coca leaf chewing needs and those of the international pharmaceutical and flavoring extract markets.

B. Establish the hectares needed to produce these legal coca requirements and then limit licenses to the number of growers necessary to cultivate the number of hectares that are needed.

C. Progressively eliminate all other production of coca by the voluntary compliance of growers or by eradication, if necessary, as soon as possible.

D. As soon as the quantity of coca necessary for chewing, legal pharmaceutical, and flavoring purposes is established, the Government of Peru should initiate a program to progressively eliminate the practice of coca leaf chewing as it pledged by its 1964 ratification of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961. Coca leaf produced for chewing could then be commensurately reduced as required by the convention.

The fact that Peru did not face up to its obligation to phase out coca leaf chewing beginning in 1964, but continued to produce large quantities of coca to sustain this harmful public health problem, is the genesis of the current uncontrolled production and traffic of coca in Peru. The practice of coca leaf chewing has to be phased out, not only for the health and welfare of the pitiful users of coca, but also to reduce coca leaf production to lessen the risk of its diversion to the illicit traffic of coca ostensibly produced for chewing.

It should be noted that all countries that ratified the Single Convention, and which had at the time permitted: (1) the quasi-medical use (eating) of opium; or (2) opium smoking; or (3) the use of cannabis for non-medical purposes, have under Article 49 ended those practices.

3. At such time as the Government of Peru proposes and commits itself to a plan which provides for reducing the licensed cultivation of coca to a level commensurate with legal requirements and which also provides for the progressive elimination of illicit coca cultivation within a reasonable period of time, the U.S. Government should commit itself to providing the financial and technical assistance that may be required by Peru, in the fields of agricultural development, administration, law enforcement and criminal justice, to limit coca production to legal requirements and suppress the illicit production and traffic of coca, coca paste and cocaine.

4. On the basis of the Peruvian commitment and program to bring the coca problem under control, the U.S. Government should urge other American states, which are seriously victimized by coca production in Peru, such as Canada, Mexico, Brazil, Argentina and Chile, to assist Peru along with the United States to the extent their financial resources will permit. The Western European countries, which have also become victims of this problem, should also be urged to join in this assistance to Peru. The narcotic control organs of the United Nations and the World Health Organization can also provide valuable technical assistance support to Peru to enable it to bring its coca production and use problem under control in compliance with its obligations to the Single Convention.

Further delay and continued failure to control coca by Peru will bring an increasing illicit production and traffic of coca and cocaine in the country. This will, on a worldwide basis, increase the availability of cocaine, lower the price and spread the use of the substance.

On the other hand, by addressing the problem, Peru will improve the health of its people, bring stability to the countryside and create an environment of agricultural and industrial development and progress, supported by foreign assistance and international corporate investment.

BOLIVIA

The illicit production of coca and cocaine in Bolivia is out of control and continues to increase at an alarming rate. Coca leaf production in 1985 is estimated at 200,000 to 240,000 tons capable of producing 200 to 240 tons of coca paste or cocaine. The Bolivian National Police estimate that in 1985 the combined total of coca paste and cocaine exported for the international illicit traffic will be 200 tons.

Bolivia ratified the Narcotics Control Conventions of 1912, 1925 and 1946. It did not ratify the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961 until 1976. By virtue of its ratification of the 1912 and 1925 Conventions, Bolivia obligated itself to control the legal import, export, manufacture and distribution of opium and coca products to limit their use to medical purposes and to suppress the illicit traffic.

By adopting the Single Convention in 1976, Bolivia obligated itself to license all coca production in the country, limit the license all coca production in the country, limit the licensed production to levels required for domestic and international legal purposes and to eradicate all illicit and wild cultivation. In ratifyng the Single Convention in 1976, Bolivia also committed itself to end the practice of the chewing of the coca leaf.

The Government of Bolivia's efforts to suppress the illicit manufacture and traffic of coca and cocaine has traditionally been sporadic and ineffective. It has totally ignored its obligation to control coca cultivation, and as of November 1, so far as can be determined, not a single coca plant has ever been eradicated by the authorities.

Anyone who chooses in Bolivia may cultivate, buy and sell the coca leaf in any quantity without fear of government intervention. Risk of arrest and prosecution for illicit manufacture and trafficking of coca and cocaine at any level is remote.

No steps have been taken to phase out the practice of coca leaf chewing. Some experts report that coca paste smoking is rapidly attracting and victimizing large numbers of coca chewers and the young who would normally chew coca but now start with paste because of its widespread availability.

Coca and cocaine enforcement operations in the Beni and Chapare regions by the Bolivian national police in September 1985 seizing a large cocaine laboratory and many coca paste conversion pits have been a very encouraging start in the right direction. But even if this is expanded and developed into a most effective operation, it will have no impact unless the constantly expanding illicit cultivation of coca is halted and the enormous cultivation of coca underway in seven large sectors of the country is phased down to the level needed for legal requirements and firmly controlled under license.

Experience over the past 50 years with illicit narcotic manufacture demonstrates that the volume of illicit narcotics manufacture is directly related to the volume of the basic raw material available whether it be opium or coca. It follows that the volume of the illicit traffic in cocaine and heroin is directly related to the volume manfactured. The volume of cocaine and heroin illicitly used is directly related to the volume trafficked.

The Committee in its 1983 visit to Bolivia as well as in its August 1985 visit has the perception that in addition to the political and social difficulties involved in reducing coca production to legal requirements Bolivia needs technical help in developing the plans and programs necessary to accomplish this. Bolivia also needs massive technical and materiel support to organize, train and equip its police, military, justice, agricultural and rural development systems to bring the illicit production and traffic of coca and cocaine under control.

It should be noted that as he had promised at his August 12 meeting with the Committee delegation, President Paz did adopt strong economic reform measures on August 29. In late September impressive initiatives against illicit coca and cocaine manufacturing activity was taken as he had indicated he would. Yet to date, so far as this committee can determine as of November 1, 1985, no action has been taken to eradicate any of the massive illicit coca cultivation. This notwithstanding the fact the 1985 Foreign Aid Authorization Act requires that 50 percent of such aid may be provided if Bolivia has enacted legislation that will establish its legal coca requirements, license the number of hectares needed to produce the legal requirements and eliminate illicit coca cultivation. The May 1985 Narcotic Decree Law meets this requirement although not as fully as it should.

The remainder of aid authorized for Bolivia for FY 1986 can only be provided after the President certifies to the Congress that Bolivia achieved the calendar year 1985 eradication targets contained in its 1983 narcotics control agreement with the United States (the eradication target figure is 4,000 hectares before December 31, 1985). Bolivia obviously cannot organize a program that will begin the phase out of illicit coca cultivation. Without this no meaningful progress in suppressing illicit coca and cocaine manufacture is possible.

Recommendations

1. This Committee calls for a more realistic recognition of the depth of the problem of illicit coca and cocaine production and traffic in Bolivia and for a broader, more comprehensive program of support and assistance by the United States to bring the production and traffic of coca and cocaine under control and to stem the drift of Bolivia into anarchy and chaos that now threatens the nation.

2. The Department of State should organize a small expert committee that would cooperate with a counterpart group organized by the Government of Bolivia. The joint expert committee should prepare a plan and provide for its implementation to bring the illicit production and traffic of coca under control with U.S. Government

assistance, and that of other concerned countries and the United Nations. The plan should:

A. Establish the quantity of coca leaf that is required in Bolivia to meet its own current coca leaf chewing needs and those of the international pharmaceutical and flavoring extract markets.

B. Establish the hectares needed to produce these legal coca requirements and then limit licenses to the number of growers necessary to cultivate the number of hectares that are needed.

C. Progressively eliminate all other production of coca by the voluntary compliance of growers or by eradication, if necessary, as soon as possible.

D. As soon as the quantity of coca necessary for chewing, legal pharmaceutical, and flavoring purposes is established, the Government of Bolivia should initiate a program to progressively eliminate the practice of coca leaf chewing as it pledged by its 1976 ratification of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961. Coca leaf produced for chewing could then be commensurately reduced as required by the convention.

The fact that Bolivia did not face up to its obligation to phase out coca leaf chewing beginning in 1976, but continued to produce large quantities of coca to sustain this harmful public health problem, is the genesis of the current uncontrolled production and traffic of coca in Bolivia. The practice of coca leaf chewing has to be phased out, not only for the health and welfare of the pitiful users of coca, now gravitating to smoking coca paste, but also to reduce coca leaf production to lessen the risk of its diversion to the illicit traffic of coca ostensibly produced for chewing.

It should be noted that all countries that ratified the Single Convention, and which had at the time permitted: (1) the quasi-medical use (eating) of opium; or (2) opium smoking; or (3) the use of cannabis for non-medical purposes, have under Article 49 ended those practices.

3. At such time as the Government of Bolivia proposes and commits itself to a plan which provides for reducing the licensed cultivation of coca to a level commensurate with legal requirements and which also provides for the progressive elimination of illicit coca cultivation within a reasonable period of time, the U.S. Government should commit itself to providing the financial and technical assistance that may be required by Bolivia, in the fields of agricultural development, administration, law enforcement and criminal justice to limit coca production to legal requirements and to suppress the illicit traffic of coca, coca paste and cocaine.

4. On the basis of the Bolivian commitment and program to bring the coca problem under control, the U.S. Government should urge other American states, which are seriously victimized by coca production in Bolivia, such as Canada, Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, Brazil, Argentina and Chile, to assist Bolivia along with the United States to the extent their financial resources will permit. The Western European countries, which have also become victims of this problem, should also be urged to join in this assistance to Bolivia. The narcotic control organs of the United Nations and the World Health Organization can also provide valuable technical assistance support to Bolivia to enable it to bring its coca production

and use problem under control in compliance with its obligations to the Single Convention.

Further delay and continued failure to control coca by Bolivia will bring an increasing illicit production and traffic of coca and cocaine in the country. This will, on a worldwide basis, increase the availability of cocaine, lower the price and spread the use of the substance.

On the other hand, by addressing the problem, Bolivia will improve the health of its people, bring stability to the countryside and create an environment of agricultural and industrial development and progress, supported by foreign assistance and international corporate investment.

BRAZIL

Although drug trafficking and abuse are viewed as relatively minor problems in Brazil, officials at all levels of the government are concerned about the signs of increased cocaine activities in their country. They clearly recognize the dangers that illicit narcotics trafficking presents to Brazil's new democratic government and the country's fragile economy, including corruption, support for insurgent groups, and the potential impact of narco-dollars on the Brazilian economy.

Brazilian authorities are fully aware of their responsibilities to suppress illicit narcotics traffic within their borders and stated firmly that they would not compromise their efforts in this area. They are sensitive to the concern that illicit cocaine activities will increase in Brazil as efforts to suppress the traffic in neighboring countries increase. They are prepared to work together with the United States and Latin American countries to eliminate illicit cultivation and trafficking.

While there is some feeling that U.S. demand for cocaine is the major cause of the coca traffic in Latin America, most Brazilian officials recognize that the problems of drug demand and drug availability are inseparable. Several officials complimented the United States for the immense efforts our country has made in the area of drug abuse prevention and control. Brazilian authorities are eager to receive U.S. support for drug abuse prevention, as well as enforcement activities and view such support as essential to Brazil's success in this area.

Brazilian drug enforcement efforts are hampered by the lack of resources, including equipment and trained personnel. The narcotics division within the Department of Federal Police (DPF) has the major responsibility for narcotics control, but its budget is not separate and it must compete for funds with all other DPF priorities. During the Select Committee delegation's visit with the Minister of Justice in August 1985, he announced that $120 million will be spent to re-equip the Federal Police. This infusion of resources should enhance the DPF's narcotics enforcement capabilities.

The Government of Brazil has developed a comprehensive plan to attack drug trafficking and abuse. To implement the plan, the Government of Brazil has restructured the Federal Drug Council and given it executive authority. The Council consists of representatives from the various ministries with drug control responsibil-

ities. The Council will establish federal drug abuse policies in the areas of prevention, investigations, enforcement and legislation and coordinate their implementation. The Council is also responsible for promoting international cooperation on narcotics issues, coordinating federal policies and programs for poor farmers who are now dependent on illicit drug crops for their livelihood, and conducting drug abuse research.

Both Houses of the Brazilian legislature have expressed a strong interest in establishing special committees, similar to the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, to assure effective oversight of Brazilian narcotics programs and policies.

The Select Committee is impressed with the commitment of the Brazilian Government to meet its responsibilities, both domestically and internationally, to control the traffic and abuse of illicit drugs. The Committee appreciates the desire of the Brazilian Government to receive assistance from the United States on all aspects of narcotics abuse and control and assures Brazil of our continued support.

Recommendations

1. The Committee commends Brazil for developing a comprehensive drug control plan and establishing a structure to implement that plan. The Committee recommends that a joint working group of appropriate Brazilian officials and their U.S. counterparts be established to determine the technical assistance, training, equipment and other support Brazil needs to carry out its plan and how the United States can best support Brazil's efforts in the areas of enforcement, training, prevention, eradication and crop and income substitution.

2. Recognizing the economic problems facing Brazil, but recognizing also the serious threat that narcotics pose to Brazil, the Committee also urges the Government of Brazil to increase the resources it dedicates to drug abuse control efforts.

3. The Committee believes that Brazil, because of its strength and because it is not yet seriously affected by the illicit narcotics trade, could play a leading role in developing a regional approach to narcotics problems in Latin America, especially with respect to reduction of illicit coca production. The Committee urges Brazil to take such a leadership role and recommends that the United States fully support Brazil in this effort.

4. The Committee recommends that the Department of State and the Government of Brazil work together to obtain a more accurate picture of the extent of illicit coca and marijuana cultivation in Brazil. The United States should provide technical support for this effort through satellite and/or aerial photography, and Brazil should commit additional personnel to survey production in areas of cultivation.

ARGENTINA

Although Argentina has not become a major producer or consumer of narcotics, it has become a transit route for the drug traffic from Bolivia and is also being used for laundering of drug assets. There are reports that cocaine processing is developing in

that sector of the country adjacent to Bolivia. DEA estimates that during 1984, six metric tons of cocaine transited through Argentina and that during the first ten months of last year, Argentine authorities seized at least 150 kilos of cocaine.

Drug intelligence and data gathering capabilities in Argentina and Uruguay are spotty. We do not know the magnitude of the drug trafficking, the number and location of the cocaine processing laboratories and the extent of the money laundering that is taking place in those nations. There are reports that the drug traffickers are purchasing expensive homes and laundering drug assets in Uruguay, which suggest that both Argentina and Uruguay have the potential for becoming major havens for the traffickers to conduct their clandestine operations.

The Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) recently increased the size of its office from 2 agents stationed in Argentina to 4 agents to handle the drug situation in South America's second largest country. This office is also responsible for monitoring the drug trafficking activities in Uruguay and Paraguay and working with their law enforcement agencies.

Although there is little hard statistical data, government leaders told our Congressional delegation in August 1985 that the domestic consumption of illicit drugs is increasing in Argentina, especially among school children.

The Afonsin Administration is aware of the explosion of cocaine production and trafficking in Colombia, Peru and Boliva, together with the potential for Argentina to be infected with the corruptive influence of the drug traffickers.

In an effort to mobilize the nation's resources, President Alfonsin has appointed a National Drug Committee headed by a Presidential advisor. Mrs. Alfonsin attended the First Lady's Conference held last April in Washington, D.C. and in Atlanta, Georgia. This year Argentina will host the International Drug Enforcement Conference; two high ranking members of the Alfonsin Administration will be visiting the United States to review cooperative law enforcement efforts between our two nations.

There is a need for Argentina to develop a drug plan to combat the traffickers before it is too late and before that nation becomes crippled by the corruptive influences of the drug traffickers.

Legislation that is being proposed by Argentine legislators includes forfeiture of drug assets, providing stiff criminal sentences for convicted traffickers, controlling money laundering activities, and also measures to monitor precursor chemicals.

Between 1971 and 1983, Argentina contributed $86,000 to the United Nation's Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC); no contributions were made to the Fund for 1984 or pledged for 1985 at the November 1984 UN Pledging Conference for Development Activities. Members of the Congressional delegation encouraged Argentina to exercise its influence and leadership within the Latin American Committee to support UNFDAC programs.

Argentina government leaders told the Select Committee delegation that Bolivia needs a special economic assistance program to combat the explosive drug problem in that nation, which is adversely impacting upon the entire South American continent, and to bolster that nation's sagging economy.

Recommendation

As a nation targeted by the drug traffickers for future illicit drug trafficking activities, Argentina should take the lead in helping to create a regional Latin American effort to combat drug trafficking and abuse.

URUGUAY

Uruguay is not presently affected by narcotics related problems to any serious degree.

As drug law enforcement efforts are applied in neighboring countries where illicit narcotics production, processing and trafficking are rampant, Uruguay could increasingly become a target for illicit narcotics activities.

The Government of Uruguay is clearly aware of the serious threat that illegal narcotics activity poses to Uruguay's society, economy and newly established democracy. The Government also recognizes its responsibility to fight the spread of narcotics into Uruguay and to work with its neighbors in the region to reduce the threat of narcotics.

The Government of Uruguay is ready and willing to cooperate with the United States on narcotics control efforts and desires U.S. technical assistance and other support to improve its narcotics control capabilities. Because the United States has provided little narcotics training for several years and previously trained Uruguayan personnel have been dispersed to units with no narcotics enforcement role, training appears to be an urgent need.

Recommendations

1. In light of Uruguay's desire to cooperate with the United States on narcotics control matters and the recent requests to DEA for assistance by Uruguayan Customs, the Committee urges that an assessment of Uruguay's drug enforcement needs be completed as soon as possible and that all possible consideration be given to reasonable requests for assistance. Special attention should be given to meeting the need and desire of Uruguayan Customs and other drug enforcement officials for training in narcotics interdiction and investigation.

2. INM and DEA should consider how they can best support Uruguay's desire to take a more active role in formulating a regional approach to narcotics control in South America.

3. The Government of Uruguay, in conjunction with the Government of the United States must remain vigilant to the possibility of increased drug trafficking and other illicit narcotics activity in Uruguay and be prepared to take the steps necessary to halt such activity before it can get out of control. In this regard, DEA should consider carefully whether it should reopen an office in Montevideo.

NIGERIA

In recent years Nigeria has become an important transit point for heroin trafficked from the Middle East and South Asia to Western Europe, Canada and the United States. Nigerian nationals for

the most part have been recruited as couriers or have developed this traffic on their own and built trafficking networks in the United States and several European countries. While it was originally not intended, the inevitable spill-over of heroin trafficking and addiction has occurred in Nigeria and neighboring countries. The drug enforcement efforts by the Nigerian authorities to address this situation has been disappointing up until now.

A trend in the smuggling of crude morphine from India to Nigeria is regarded as an indicator of heroin laboratories in Nigeria. In 1984, 7 seizures amounting to 5 kilos were seized. In 1985, 21 seizures totaling 27 kilos of morphine were effected. Bombay was the origin of the majority of the shipments and Nigerian nationals smuggling the morphine in baggage were mostly the couriers. As with the heroin trafficking that transits Nigeria, any heroin that is illicitly manufactured there is expected to be directed at Western European countries, Canada and the United States.

During 1985 the Drug Enforcement Administration assigned two agents to the American Embassy at Lagos, Nigeria, to assist in training Nigerian police narcotic investigators and to assist them in developing narcotics investigations in the traffic affecting the United States. This Committee looks forward to this as a significant first step in curtailing the relatively recent emergence of Nigeria as a significant center of heroin activity affecting the United States.

MOROCCO

In its report for 1985 the International Narcotics Control Board (INCB) reported that in North Africa, the bulk of the traffic still consists of cannabis and its derivatives from Morocco, where large-scale illicit cultivation takes place. The Moroccan authorities focus their efforts on enforcement during transport. The size of the seizures effected both within the country itself and abroad indicates the dimensions of the illicit cultivation. Some cannabis is being eradicated.

This Committee is informed of reports of illicit opium poppy cultivation in Morocco during 1985, a new and deeply disturbing trend.

About 650 tons of cannabis are produced annually in the Western Rif area of the country between the towns of Chechauoen and Ketama. About 66 percent of this production is consumed in Morocco in the form of marijuana, hashish and liquid hashish. About 50 tons of hashish and 25 tons of liquid hashish are supplied annually to other North African countries, Spain, France, Germany, Belgium, The Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Canada and the United States. Of the 6,000 hectares of cannabis cultivated annually, not more than 5 are eradicated.

Of the estimated 7,000 tons of cannabis leaf produced, about 300 tons are seized on an annual basis. The government of Morocco has no plans for phasing out cannabis production. The authorities argue that it will eventually come about through economic development in Morocco and by reducing the demand for Moroccan hashish and marijuana abroad.

Morocco has been a major supplier of hashish to the United States since the late 1960's. Most of it comes directly smuggled into private docks and quiet marinas by sailing vessels, long-range motor yachts and small freighters. Light aircraft equipped for long-range flying also smuggle hashish from Morocco to small airports and airstrips in the Northeast area of the United States. Moroccan hashish and hashish oil is often smuggled by small operators and tourists from Spain or other points in Western Europe, particularly the United Kingdom and The Netherlands.

Between 10 and 20 tons of hashish, 5 to 10 percent of the total 200 tons entering the United States annually, originate in Morocco. For at least 20 years Morocco has resisted the pleas of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the International Narcotics Control Board as well as several European nations victimized by this hashish traffic that the illicit production be phased out. Citing political and economic difficulties, the Moroccan authorities have successfully evaded their obligations under the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961 to suppress the illicit production and traffic of hashish in their country.

Recommendation

1. It is time the United States, together with other interested governments, particularly Canada and several Western European countries and the U.N. Narcotics Commission and International Narcotics Control Board, negotiate a pledge on the part of Morocco to phase out the illicit production of hashish and provide the insignificant technical and financial support that might be needed to accomplish the end of this production.

ITALY

The Italian authorities continue to vigorously suppress organized criminal efforts in Sicily and the Milan area to establish illicit heroin manufacturing operations. The three Italian Police Services, the Guardia di Finanze, National Police and Carabiniere, are to be commended for the cooperation they have historically extended to the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration and its predecessor agencies to suppress the illicit manufacture and traffic in narcotic drugs in Italy affecting the United States.

During 1985 no illicit heroin manufacturing laboratory was uncovered in Italy, while 184 kilos of heroin were seized that originated in Southeast and Southwest Asia. Italy is experiencing the same escalating problem with the internal traffic and addiction to heroin as the other countries of Western Europe.

The indictments and trials of several hundred prominent Mafia criminals in Italy during 1985 have dramatically reduced the ability of their organizations to obtain heroin from Southeast and Southwest Asia for smuggling to the Mafia associates in the United States. Notwithstanding, the ability of Mafia elements in Sicily to develop such trafficking arrangements remains a serious threat considering the vast quantities of heroin available in Thailand and Pakistan.

The unrelenting drug enforcement effort of the Italian authorities must continue and both the Governments of the United States

and Italy must ensure that adequate manpower, resources and equipment are assigned to constantly increase the suppression rate against this traffic. Important narcotic arrests and seizures in both countries should be vigorously prosecuted and substantial prison terms meted out to convicted violators.

SRI LANKA

By mid-1985, 64 Sri Lankan nationals had been arrested in Western Europe smuggling a total of 23 kilos of heroin from Sri Lanka by air concealed in baggage, on their bodies or internally in their bodies. The heroin is allegedly of Southwest and Southeast Asian origin. This trend which became significant in 1984 has been repeatedly linked to a movement of Sri Lankan Tamils to raise money to finance the secession of a part of the country where they are dominant from the rest of the country.

Reports indicate that 20,000 people in Sri Lanka have become addicted to heroin; some of them are boys as young as 12 years of age. The Sri Lankan Government has recognized the problem and in 1984 imposed the death penalty on trafficking, but it has not been used and has not been a deterrent.

While the traffic which utilizes Sri Lankan couriers and which is linked with the traffic originating in Bombay, India, appears to be directed principally at Western Europe, some arrests and seizures have been made from couriers attempting to enter the United States. It is a threat that should be monitored vigilantly by DEA and Customs.

INDIA

India, as the world's largest and now the only producer of gum opium for legal pharmaceutical purposes, has historically been remarkably free of opium diversion and the illicit manufacture and traffic of heroin. This has been largely due to an effective opium production control system.

The Government of India is vigilant in preventing leakage from legal opium production and from the large stockpile of opium production which currently exists. There are also reports of some illicit opium production. In recent years India has been a source for methaqualone originating in or transiting the country. There are indications this traffic has leveled off following the prohibition of the import, manufacture, and sale of methaqualone in January 1984.

Because of its geographic location between the two major illicit supply regions of Southeast Asia and the Near and Middle East, India in the last two years has developed into a major transit route for heroin, whereas heretofore only hashish originating in Nepal and Pakistan transited the country.

In Thailand, and Burma, there are reports of a continuation of a relatively new trend in the smuggling of heroin, morphine base, and opium from Burma to India for onward smuggling to Western Europe and North America and consumption in India. Chemicals necessary to manufacture morphine base and heroin are in turn smuggled to Burma from India.

Heroin smuggling from India to Western Europe, Canada and the United States is increasing. Seizures of heroin in Europe from smugglers who originated their journey in India in 1983 totaled 160 kilos; in 1984, 280 kilos; in 1985, 444 kilos. In the United States, seizures of heroin smuggled from India amounted to 22 kilos in 1983; 81 kilos in 1984 and 84 kilos in 1985. Authorities report a large percentage of this heroin originated in Pakistan or Afghanistan.

In 1981, nine kilos of heroin were seized in India; in 1982, 29 kilos; in 1983; 122 kilos; and in 1984, 150 kilos were seized. In 1985, preliminary statistics indicated 950 kilos were seized. In January 1986, Indian authorities seized 615 kilos of heroin in a village 93 miles from Bombay where it was being stored apparently for smuggling from Bombay to Western Europe and North America. This is the largest heroin seizure of record ever made. It is believed to have come to India from Pakistan. Two heroin conversion laboratories were also seized in 1985.

The Government of India is greatly concerned with these developments and is carrying out a vigorous suppression effort and cooperating with other concerned governments affected by this traffic.

Recommendations

1. There is very great international concern with these relatively new illicit traffic trends occurring in India. The Committee urges the Government of India to ensure that its international narcotic enforcement cooperation is brought to maximum effectiveness to meet this threat.

2. Experts believe that because of its geographic location, the Government of India's legal narcotic control system for the production and manufacture of narcotic and psychotropic substances is now being severely tested. Ruthless and resourceful international narcotic organizations are now targeting India for supplies of narcotic and psychotropic drugs and as a base for their international trafficking operations. The government should ensure that its regulatory narcotics and psychotropic control mechanisms remain equal to the challenge.

In 1984, 434 tons of opium were legally produced in India and 4.5 tons diverted from legal production were seized. In 1985, production was estimated at 764 tons and for 1986, 700 tons.

Given the very great excess of legal stocks of opium and poppy straw and the depression of the world legal market, this Committee is concerned that opium stocks in India increased 7-fold from 1977 to 1983 and with the exception of 1983, opium production exceeded export or is expected to exceed export each year between 1977 and 1986. Given the diversion threat highly sophisticated international criminal groups now pose to legal opium production in India as a raw material for heroin manufacture and traffic, this Committee believes the Government of India should reduce legal opium production until such time its stockpile is reduced to levels acceptable to the International Narcotics Control Board. Reducing the area and volume of opium production provides for more effective security to prevent opium diversion to the illicit traffic.

3. The Government of India should also take measures to provide for more stringent penalties against convicted traffickers and to in-

crease and intensify narcotic enforcement operations in this new and rapidly developing illicit traffic phenomenon.

4. In its report for 1984 this Committee reported that the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) planned to assign one additional agent to the two agents already stationed at New Delhi. Hopefully DEA will follow illicit traffic trends in India closely with a view to further increasing the agent staff at New Delhi, or assigning agents to the Consulate General at Bombay where there would seem to be a critical need for such assignments. The Committee has been informed that during 1986 DEA will increase its agent staff at New Delhi from two to five and open an office at the U.S. Consulate General at Bombay staffed by two agents.

MALAYSIA

About a decade ago, Malaysia became a center for the illicit manufacture and traffic of heroin to Western Europe, Australia, Canada and the United States. The heroin is produced from opiate raw materials originating in Burma and Thailand. Some of the heroin also originates in these two source countries and merely transits Malaysia. It is estimated that there are as many as 250,000 addicts in Malaysia with 80 percent addicted to heroin and the remainder to opium. Marijuana abuse is also significant, originating with domestic production and imports from Thailand and Indonesia. The authorities make every effort to suppress this illicit manufacturing and trafficking activity and have been successful in disrupting and curtailing it, particularly as a heroin supply center for international trafficking.

In 1985 a five year program to intensify drug enforcement and prevention programs was inaugurated. On an annual basis about 11,650 narcotic arrests are made. In 1984, 243 kilos of heroin, 4 laboratories, and 871 kilos of opium were seized. During the first 9 months of 1985, 98 kilos of heroin, 3 laboratories and 743 kilos of opium were seized.

Recommendation

Malaysia is commended for its vigorous suppression of the illicit manufacture and traffic of heroin and hopefully will continue its efforts. It should also in concert with other concerned governments urge Thailand and Burma to address the problem of the uncontrolled production of opium in their countries responsible for the heavy traffic and addiction to heroin affecting Malaysia.

HONG KONG

Hong Kong continues to serve as a center for the illicit manufacture of heroin made from heroin base smuggled from Thailand by air and fishing trawlers. Most of this heroin is consumed by the very large heroin addict population in the territory. A portion of this heroin supply is also smuggled to Australia and the United States.

The Hong Kong authorities carry out a vigorous and highly effective narcotic enforcement policy and in 1985 seized 214 kilos of heroin. They also cooperate most effectively with all governments seeking cooperation in narcotics enforcement investigations. New

legislation provides for the provision of records officially requested in a Letter of Request or Rogatory Commission to foreign authorities in a narcotic investigation if such is likely to lead to criminal prosecution on narcotics charges.

Recommendation

1. This Committee commends the effective narcotic enforcement efforts of the Hong Kong Government which continues to prevent heroin smuggling to the United States from becoming significant. It urges the Government of Hong Kong to maintain its vigorous enforcement efforts within its territory and the effective international cooperation it carries out on a worldwide basis.

THAILAND

In June 1985 two individuals coming from Bangkok were arrested at the Seattle, Washington, International Airport by Customs authorities as they attempted to smuggle 95 kilos of heroin into the United States. The heroin was cleverly concealed in aluminum ice buckets they were transporting as manufacturer's samples. Investigation revealed that they had been successful in smuggling two similar shipments of the same quantity of heroin into the United States earlier in the year. The 95 kilo shipment seized represented the largest heroin seizure made in the United States since 1974 and the largest heroin seizure of record ever made in the United States of heroin of southeast Asian origin.

An estimated 20 percent of the heroin entering the United States comes from Southeast Asia, mostly from Thailand but also Burma, Malaysia and Hong Kong, where it is produce from opiate raw material originating in Burma, Thailand and possibly Laos.

Thailand continues to produce on an annual basis 35 to 50 tons of opium. Large clandestine heroin manufacturing facilities persistently operate within the country, particularly in remote sections of the border with Burma.

Chiang Mai, Bangkok and Songkhla are major centers for the international trafficking of heroin originating in Burma and Thailand.

In Thailand the United Nations' Crop Replacement and Community Development Pilot Program in the northwest opium growing region has identified successful substitute crops and market possibilities for poppy growers. Thai, United States and other bilateral funding contribute to this work.

Up until now there has been disappointment on the part of the international technicians assisting the Thai authorities on this work over the failure of the government since 1976 to phase out opium production as the replacement crops come on line.

In 1984 as estimated 41.5 tons of opium was produced on 7,900 hectares. In 1985 cultivation was increased to 9,654 hectares, but allegedly only 38 tons of opium was produced due to unfavorable weather. Of the 1985 crop 517 hectares were eradicated. While this eradication had only minor impact on opium production in 1985, it demonstrated that eradication could be implemented without causing serious political and social disruption as Thai authorities had long feared it would.

The Thai Government plans for the 1986 crop are to order farmers in villages where crop substitutes, health, social, education and rural development programs have been implemented, not to grow opium. Opium grown in such villages would then be eradicated.

This Committee is very encouraged by the Thai Government's efforts to phase out illicit opium production in its territory and looks forward to continuing progress in this endeavor and is hopeful if farmers do not comply, the authorities will not hesitate to eradicate.

The Committee has been concerned with the explosive organized production of high grade marijuana in northeast Thailand in recent years, significant quantities of which are smuggled to the United States. It commends the Thai Government for its eradication of about 1,900 tons of this cultivation in 1985 and the seizure of 101 tons destined for export.

The Committee also commends the Thai Government for its narcotic enforcement efforts during 1985 which resulted in 37,000 arrests and the seizure of 3.3 tons of opium and 2 tons of heroin.

Recommendations

1. The Committee urges Thailand to move forward in its efforts to phase out opium production through socio-economic development programs in the hill tribe villages where it is produced with a view to ending production entirely by 1990. Where necessary, it must eradicate. If additional funding is required, UNFDAC, the United States and other industrial democracies affected by the problem should be invited to contribute.

2. Recognizing the traditional indifference of the Burmese Government to active direct narcotic enforcement cooperation and joint operations along the Thai-Burmese border, the Committee urges the Government of Thailand to increase and intensify its efforts to establish this type of active, ongoing operational cooperation with the Burmese Government if the enormous illicit manufacture and traffic of heroin in the remote sectors of their joint border is to be effectively suppressed. Again, the United States and all the industrial democracies tragically affected by this traffic as well as the United Nations would be receptive to providing logistical and material support assistance to the Thai and Burmese Governments in such joint ventures.

BURMA

The largest illicit production of opium in the world exists in Burma where production between 1981 and 1985 has been at about 500 tons annually. In areas of the country where this opium production is accessible to government forces it has for several years been eradicated.

In 1985 the Burmese Government reported the eradication of 9,551 hectares of poppy in a crop that totaled 71,000 hectares. An obstacle to a more effective eradication of this opium production is that along with illicit heroin manufacture for international trafficking it is controlled by insurgent groups in the Shan and Cachin states. Burma's obsessive nonalignment policy also impedes meaningful enforcement cooperation with the Peoples Republic of China,

Thailand, Malaysia and India that could dramatically curtail the massive manufacturing and traffic of heroin taking place in its territory.

During 1985 the Government of Burma began the aerial spraying of illicit opium poppy cultivation with good success in the insurgent areas. This has been continued and increased in 1985 and the Burmese Government is to be commended for this initiative. If as it is hoped the logistical obstacles and the tactical problems and dangers can be surmounted opium poppy production in the remote regions of Burma can be effectively eradicated as it stands exposed and highly vulnerable to aerial spraying for 60 to 90 days each year.

Recommendations

1. The Committee urges Burma with international assistance to consistently develop and intensify its program to eradicate illicit opium poppy production through the aerial application of herbicide in areas where growers refuse to end this production. This eradication technique if skillfully applied in sufficient strength has the ability within 2 to 3 years to eliminate any organized illicit opium production in Burma.

2. The Committee urges Burma to develop direct and active narcotic enforcement cooperation with Thailand and Malaysia as a means to stem the flow of heroin and opiate raw materials from Burma to and through those countries.

3. The Government of Burma should seek the assistance of the Government of Thailand to work jointly along the Thai-Burmese border to detect and seize the heroin refineries operated along their mutual border.

4. Burma should increase and intensify its narcotic intelligence collection and enforcement efforts within the country to uncover the major organizations responsible for the internal and international trafficking activity and bring them to justice.

5. There are reports that due to the Thai Government's aggressive disruption of the traffic from Burma into Thailand, some of the criminal groups are moving heroin westward into India and Bangladesh for smuggling to Western Europe and North America as well as for consumption in India. Chemicals necessary for the illicit manufacture of morphine base from opium and the conversion of morphine base to heroin are reported to be moving from India to the insurgent drug trafficking groups in Burma. The Burmese Government should develop direct narcotic enforcement cooperation with India and Bangladesh to stem the movement of heroin from Burma and chemicals for heroin manufacture from India.

LEBANON

Prior to the chaos and breakdown in public order caused by the sectarian and political warfare that began in Lebanon in 1976, the government had effectively curtailed the illicit manufacture of heroin which posed a constant threat. It never effectively took the heavy illicit cultivation of hashish under control which through all the strife has persisted. Frequent allegations of Syrian Government tolerance of the hashish production and traffic in Lebanese terri-

tory under its control are reported. Of the 200 tons of hashish entering the United States annually, 60 tons or 30 percent reportedly originate in Lebanon.

Organized networks of Lebanese narcotic traffickers are entrenched in several regions of the United States, particularly Massachusetts and the Detroit and Cleveland areas to where they illicitly import heroin from Lebanon for distribution. The heroin coming from Lebanon is illicitly manufactured there or reportedly originates in Syria, Turkey or Iran. In recent years illicit opium production has developed and persisted in Lebanon and is an additional cause of concern.

Notwithstanding the chaotic political condition which makes law and order nearly impossible, during 1985 the Lebanese authorities made 17 seizures of heroin totaling 16 kilos and 43 seizures of hashish totaling 4.7 tons.

Obviously any solution to the problem of heroin and hashish production and traffic in Lebanon is contingent upon bringing about a political solution to the tragic events that have transpired since 1976. Certainly the harm the production and traffic in drugs in Lebanon is causing the United States and several other countries is an added incentive for increasing efforts to bring about a political solution in Lebanon.

SYRIA

During the period of time prior to 1972, when large quantities of gum opium were diverted from legal production in Turkey, large portions of that opium were smuggled into Syria for conversion to morphine base and transmitted to Beirut or Marseille for the clandestine manufacture of heroin for smuggling to the United States and Canada. Most of this morphine base production in Syria was in the northern city of Aleppo, close to Turkey. To a lesser extent the cities of Hamah and Homs were also utilized for this activity. Now morphine base, heroin base and heroin itself is being smuggled from Southern Turkey. The morphine and heroin base is being converted into high grade heroin at Aleppo, Hamah and Homs. Together with the heroin smuggled directly into Syria from Turkey, it is taken to Damascus for smuggling via airline passengers to Western Europe for use there or smuggling onward to Canada and the United States.

This trafficking route during 1985 continued at about the same level as 1984. The Syrian authorities reported ten heroin seizures totaling 15.7 kilos.

Heroin and morphine base from Syria is also being smuggled to Lebanon and Sicily for refining or in the case of heroin for onward shipment to Canada and the United States.

Recommendation

Syria has not been effective in suppressing this recent trend of heroin manufacture in its territory nor of offering the hand of cooperation to the countries affected by this traffic. The United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs should look into this situation as should the International Narcotics Control board to ensure Syria is abiding by its obligations to the Single Convention on Nar-

cotic Drugs of 1961 and urge that remedial action be taken by the Syrian Government to prevent its territory from being used as an illicit heroin manufacturing and trafficking center. This committee was astonished to find that the International Narcotic Control Board in its report for 1985 omitted any reference to Syria and the significant role its territory plays as an illicit manufacturing and transiting center for heroin affecting Western Europe and North America.

TURKEY

Opium, morphine, heroin base and heroin are being produced in Iran, Afghanistan and Pakistan in enormous quantities. While great quantities of these narcotic drugs are being consumed in those producer countries, much of this production is smuggled to Western Europe and North America to create and sustain serious heroin addiction problems. An important route of this traffic is through Turkey.

Reports are also received of persistent illicit opium production in remote areas of Turkey. This production along with morphine smuggled in from the east is converted into heroin in clandestine laboratories in Eastern Turkey and in the Kilis and Gaziantep area along the Syrian border. Reports are also received of sporadic diversion of gum opium form the legal opium poppy produced for its straw under license for delivery to the government. This too contributed to the illicit heroin manufacture and traffic originating in Turkey. In 1985, about 10,200 hectares of poppy were licensed for straw production, scattered over 7 provinces of the country.

During 1985 an investigation by DEA resulted in the arrest of several Turkish nationals in New York operating a heroin smuggling ring between the latter city and Istanbul. The seizure of 12 kilos of heroin a courier was attempting to smuggle from Istanbul by air into New York City in November 1985 triggered the exposure of this network. Investigation determined that since May 1985 the organization had smuggled 132 kilos of heroin from Turkey to the United States. This Committee has also been informed that heroin known or presumed to have been obtained or produced in Turkey accounted for at least 17.7 percent of the heroin seizures made in Europe in 1985.

The Government of Turkey had addressed the problem of illicit manufacture and traffic within the country that supplies heroin to Western Europe and North America by increasing and intensifying the narcotic suppression activities of the Turkish National Police, Jandarma and Customs. However, the source of the problem is the unlimited supplies of opiate raw material and heroin entering the country via Iran as well as some supplies of opium illicitly produced and opium that can be diverted from the legal poppy crop.

Recommendations

1. The Government of Turkey should use its leadership role on the U.N. Sub-Commission on Narcotics and Related Matters in the Near and Middle East to improve mutual cooperation leading to more intensified eradication of illicit opium production and suppression of illicit manufacture and traffic in Pakistan, Afghanistan

and Iran. Turkey is a victim of this traffic and its territory is being used for the illicit processing and transit of opium, morphine and heroin from those countries to the west. Turkey is highly respected by its fellow Member States of the Sub-Commission and has a long record of experience and success in active international narcotic control cooperation.

This Committee urges the Government of Turkey to take a leadership role in persuading the U.N. narcotic control bodies to implement the proposal of the Government of Iran that a satellite survey be taken of Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan and Turkey to detect the extent of illicit poppy production taking place for the purpose of taking appropriate eradication efforts.

2. The U.N. Commission on Narcotic Drugs should request the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations to authorize the Secretary General to convene annual meetings between the heads of national drug law enforcement agencies from States in the Near and Middle East, from Europe and from Members of the League of Arab States immediately following the sessions of the Sub-Commission which are held in the fourth quarter of every year under the authority of Council Resolution 1776 (LIV) of May 18, 1973, and preferably at the invitation of a Member State in the European region.

3. The Turkish National Police narcotic enforcement capability has reached a point where it can begin to develop joint prosecutions, with European, United States and Canadian narcotic enforcement services, of Turkish nationals in Turkey who have been identified in prosecutions abroad as participants, suppliers, financiers or directors of a narcotic smuggling operation. The Turkish authorities should make every effort to vigorously prosecute narcotic violators in Turkey on the basis of evidence that can be supplied by Western European and North American narcotic enforcement services.

4. As a start in increasing and improving its narcotic intelligence collection and distribution capability, the Turkish National Police supported by the Jandarma and Customs should increase the volume of information it exchanges annually with all countries related to the problem of illicit narcotic manufacturing and traffic in Turkey. Experience demonstrates that the more information a country such as Turkey transmits to other countries, the more actionable intelligence they receive in return from other countries.

5. Because it is used as a transit country for the processing and movement of narcotic drugs from the Near and Middle East to the West, it is believed that as means of improving narcotic enforcement effectiveness the Turkish National Police, Jandarma and Customs should increase and intensify their narcotic enforcement cooperation with counterpart agencies in Iran, Syria, Iraq, Greece and Bulgaria.

6. Recognizing that either acetic anhydride or acetyl chloride are chemicals essential to transforming morphine base to heroin hydrochloride, the Government of Turkey should have its narcotic enforcement services monitor the movement of this substance within Turkey as a means to detect and seize clandestine heroin laboratories which reportedly are increasing in number.

7. Unconfirmed information continued to be received of sporadic illicit opium cultivation in remote areas of the provinces of Corum, Amasya and Tokat which are northeast of Ankara in the direction of the Black Sea. Similar information is received relative to the provinces of Malatya, Elazig and Adyaman in Southeastern Turkey. Legal opium production was ended in those provinces between 1968 and 1970 and licensed production of poppy permitted in 7 provinces in the central Anatolian region since 1975 has not been authorized in the six provinces listed above. The State Department should provide all possible technical and equipment assistance to the Turkish Jandarma to enable it to develop an aerial detection capability to uncover widely scattered illicit opium cultivation that may take place in its territory. The Turkish Government vigorously eradicates any illicit opium production uncovered in the country.

8. Given the extremely high level of excess legal stocks of opium, poppy straw concentrate and poppy straw that exists in the legal opiate raw material producer countries and the depression in the market for those materials, in concert with the spirit of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961 the Government of Turkey, to increase the effectiveness of poppy cultivation control, should consider reducing the number of provinces where poppy is authorized for cultivation from 7 to 4.

IRAN

Addiction in Iran to heroin and opium is reported to affect a million people. The Government has assigned high priority to addressing the problem and reports campaigns against the illicit trafficking and abuse of drugs.

Very great quantities of opium and heroin are being trafficked into Iran from Afghanistan and Pakistan. Important arrests and seizures are made by the authorities. About 40 percent of the traffickers are Afghans, the remainder are Pakistanis, Indians and Sri Lankans.

Iran prohibited opium production in 1955 with great success reducing opium addiction from 1.7 million to about 250 thousand. It reauthorized production in 1969 to maintain opium addicts because opium supplies were being smuggled in from Turkey, Afghanistan and Pakistan. In 1979 a ban on opium production was reestablished. The Government of Iran is now asking that a survey be conducted throughout the U.N. Sub-Commission region of Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan and Pakistan to identify the extent and location of opium poppy cultivation for the purpose of taking appropriate eradication measures.

Nothwithstanding the opium production ban of 1979 and reports of eradication of illicit cultivation and severe punishment of the growers, some sources report Iran as the largest producer of opium in the Near and Middle East Region at 400 to 500 tons annually. It is also known that suppliers of opium, morphine base and heroin are smuggled into Turkey from Iran for processing or smuggling to Western Europe, the United States and Canada. Presumedly these opiates originate from production in Iran or are passing through Iran from Afghanistan and Pakistan.

65-444 O - 86 - 3

Recommendation

The Government of Iran has called for a satellite survey of poppy cultivation throughout all 4 countries of the region to determine where the enormous poppy production known to exist in the region is actually taking place. The State Department, through participation in the U.N. Commission on Narcotic Drugs, the parent of the Sub-Commission on Illicit Drug Traffic and Related Matters in the Near and Middle East, and as a staunch supporter of the work of the International Narcotics Control Board and the U.N. Fund for Drug Abuse Control, should make every effort to ensure those international narcotics control bodies organize and implement the satellite survey proposed by Iran of Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan and Pakistan to detect the extent of opium poppy cultivation and where it is taking place.

AFGHANISTAN

During 1985 the DEA in concert with police authorities in The Netherlands, Lebanon and Pakistan developed evidence against an Afghan national reported to be a billionaire with direct sources of supply for heroin from the Northwest Frontier Province of Pakistan (NWFP) and Afghanistan.

Evidence developed indicated that this major Afghan narcotic trafficker was involved in supplying Afghan rebels with weapons in exchange for heroin and hashish, portions of which were eventually distributed in Western Europe and the United States. Arrests and seizures during 1985 seriously disrupted this organization. Documents seized indicated this major Afghan trafficker had shipped 150,000 automatic weapons to Afghanistan. He is now incarcerated in The Netherlands awaiting extradition to the United States.

The Government of Afghanistan reports only limited cultivation of opium in remote areas. Frequent large seizures of opium, heroin and hashish are made within the country, indicating heroin may be illicitly manufactured. Neighboring countries report the seizure of opiates, mainly opium in areas bordering Afghanistan, indicating opium continues to be the main export for processing abroad into heroin rather than in Afghanistan.

U.S. State Department estimates are that production in 1984 of 140 to 180 tons increased to 300 to 400 tons in 1985.

Recommendations

1. The United States, most Western European and Arab countries are being tragically victimized by opium or heroin originating from opium and hashish produced in Afghanistan. The victim countries are the donors of the humanitarian aid sent to Afghanistan and to Afghan refugees who have fled their country.

It is time the United States, Canada, Western European and the Arab countries begin to demand that the Mujahideen leadership through their legendary tribal communication network put an end to the production of opium, morphine base and heroin in their territory so tragically affecting the countries which are their friends and benefactors.

2. The United States should continue to urge the U.N. Subcommission on Narcotics and Related Matters in the Near and Middle

East to intensify its efforts to have the Democratic Government of Afghanistan prevent the illicit production of opium and manufacture and traffic of morphine and heroin in the territory under its control.

3. The U.N. International Narcotics Control Board (INCB), taking into account the work of the Sub-Commission, should send a study mission to Afghanistan to assess the extent of opium and heroin production and make recommendations how the United Nations and interested governments can prevail upon the government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the Mujahideen elements to end the illicit production of opium fueling much of the world's heroin problem.

PAKISTAN

The Government of Pakistan, in compliance with the requirements of the Single Convention on Narcotics Drugs of 1961, prohibited the production of opium in 1979. However, while it substantially reduced opium production, it has permitted it to continue in the tribal areas of the country for political reasons. In December 1983, the Government of Pakistan also announced as of that time the national narcotics control laws would be applied in the tribal areas. This was directed specifically at the enormous volume of illicit manufacture and traffic of heroin originating in the area from opium of Pakistani and Afghan origin.

Six years have elapsed since Pakistan banned the production of opium in its territory. Substantial quantities continue to be produced. This Committee is reliably informed that opium production in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) agencies where it has been permitted to continue—Khyber, Oraksai, Kurram and South Waziristan—has increased to fill the void created where opium production was ended gradually since 1980.

This Committee believes that considerably more opium, than the 40 to 70 tons that was estimated for the 1985 crop was produced in Pakistan. Actual production could range as high as 200 tons. During 1985 the Government conducted an aerial survey of the poppy growing regions of the NWFP but has not as yet released the results.

The International Narcotics Control Board (INCB) in paragraph 84 of its Report for 1985 commented "The amounts of opiates (opium, morphine, and heroin) which, according to estimates are produced illicitly within Pakistan can account for only a small fraction of what is consumed domestically and smuggled abroad. To make up the shortfall, traffickers must be utilizing stocks and/or smuggling supplies into the country from abroad and or obtaining additional supplies locally. It is therefore an urgent necessity to enlarge upon those intra- and inter-regional activities which will yield a more precise picture of the extent and location of poppy cultivation."

Opium produced in Pakistan and some from Afghanistan as well as some morphine base from the latter country have since about 1979 been illicitly transformed in Pakistan to quantities never before seen or imagined in the illicit traffic. During the first six months of 1985, 5 metric tons of heroin were seized in Pakistan.

In both Western Europe, the United States and Canada during 1985, about 50 percent of the heroin seized originated in Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iran, Turkey or India. While that heroin may be illicitly manufactured in any of the above countries indicators are that the bulk of it is illicitly manufactured in Pakistan.

Opium produced in the Northwest Frontier Province (NWFP) and Afghanistan is shipped to the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA), Khyber, Orakzai, Kurram and South Waziristan.

It is then transported by truck to Peshawar. From there it moved by road southward through the NWFP to areas of Baluchistan adjacent to the Afghan border. From Baluchistan the heroin moves west via Afghanistan to Iran, Europe, Canada and the United States.

Pakistani heroin is also smuggled to the southern Markan Coast of Baluchistan where it is smuggled by vessels westward to Europe and North America. This heroin is also smuggled by road, rail or aircraft to Karachi, Rawalpindi or Lahore where it is routed by sea or air to the United States, Canada and Western Europe by way of New Delhi, Bombay, the Persian Gulf States and or Western Europe.

Recommendations

1. It is time for the Government of Pakistan to prepare a comprehensive plan that will schedule the progressive elimination of opium cultivation in its territory providing a final termination date, what will be accomplished on an annual basis and what international assistance might be required.

2. The Government of Pakistan must begin implementation of its national narcotic laws in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas to effectively suppress the illicit manufacture and traffic of heroin taking place in that territory, particularly around Lake Kotal and the Khyber Agency.

3. This Committee commends the Government of Pakistan for its continuing role and effective contribution in the work of the U.N. Sub-Commission on Illicit Drug Traffic and Related Matters in the Near and Middle East, particularly the initiative by the Sub-Commission which calls for a feasibility and cost study to detect the extent of an illicit opium poppy cultivation in the Sub-Commission region with a view to obtaining assistance for implementation of such a program through the U.N. Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC).

4. This Committee has a serious concern with the continuing traffic of hashish directed at the United States from abroad estimated to average about 200 tons annually. Investigation indicates that about 65 pecent or 130 tons are now originating in Pakistan which has surpassed Lebanon as the leading source affecting the United States.

Notwithstanding the re-emphasis against the illicit production of hashish in Pakistan in 1979 by the Hadd Ordinance, it is unabated. While it is recognized that some of the hashish trafficked from Pakistan may originate in Afghanistan, several hundred tons continue to be openly produced yearly in Pakistan in violation of Article 28 of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961.

PANAMA

Panama because of its geographic position on both the air and sea routes from South America to North America and its free port facilities has historically been a hub for contraband smuggling, including narcotics.

Panama is a transfer point for cocaine and marijuana moving from South America to the United States and for the chemicals required for cocaine manufacture from the United States and Europe to South America.

Marijuana and cocaine arrives in Panama in light aircraft and small coastal vessels for transfer to other aircraft and vessels for smuggling to the United States. Occasionally the narcotics are stored in Panama prior to onward shipment. Reports indicate that criminal elements and corruption in Panama makes this activity possible, however, most of it is carried out in Panama by Colombian and Bolivian traffickers.

Panama has long been a world major banking center and has one hundred twenty banks. Favorable tax, bank secrecy and corporate laws and the fact the U.S. dollar is the currency, make Panama an ideal center for the laundering of international narcotic trafficking proceeds.

Panama produces about 500 hectares of marijuana and the authorities report in 1985 about half of this was destroyed via aerial spray eradication. Plans have been reported for an increased utilization of this technique during 1986.

Recommendations

1. Panama continues to have the potential to increase its role as a transit center for South American cocaine and as an illicit manufacturer of cocaine and grower of coca. The Governments of Panama and the United States must exercise constant vigilance in this regard.

The narcotic threat Panama poses to the United States will only abate when the uncontrolled production and traffic of coca and cocaine in South America is brought under control.

2. While the bank secrecy laws in Panama invite money laundering and make it extremely difficult to investigate and utilize money transfers through Panamanian banks as evidenced in the prosecution of narcotic violators and to trace, seize and forfeit their monetary or property assets the U.S. drug enforcement efforts with the Panamanian authorities on overcoming this problem leaves much to be desired.

When Colombian nationals, Jorge Ochea and Gilberto Rodriguez Orjuela, were identified as drug traffickers and as the majority owners of the First Inter-Americas Bank in Panama and as using it to launder drug trafficking proceeds, Panamanian authorities intervened on the basis of a decree which requires that banks, their directors, officers and employees must maintain a good reputation. The bank was placed under the control of the banking commission.

Panama is not the first country with bank secrecy laws where banks have been used to facilitate narcotic trafficking. Narcotic trafficking is a heinous and sordid crime. Almost all the world's governments have bound themselves to assist each other in sup-

pressing it. It is the experience of this Committee that whenever evidence can be produced that narcotic violators are using a bank in a country with bank secrecy the authorities will take steps to end that utilization if the individuals are indicted or convicted.

The DEA under the provision of Article 35 of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961 and Article 21 of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971 should in major international narcotic conspiracy investigations in concert with the U.S. Attorneys Office and Grand Juries increase efforts to provide Panamanian authorities with any evidence they obtain relative to the utilization of any Panamanian banks in furtherance of narcotic trafficking activity. Countries where bank secrecy is the law or the tradition, such as Panama, take the position that secrecy is for business and financial purposes, not to further criminal activity such as narcotic trafficking nor is secrecy intended to protect narcotic traffickers.

This Committee is convinced that presented with sufficient evidence through the appropriate channels as to the utilization of Panamanian banks for narcotic trafficking purposes, the Government of Panama will take corrective action.

COSTA RICA

This Committee has reported in the past that Costa Rica should continue to be monitored as a potential significant marijuana source for the United States. The Committee has also noted that Costa Rica also has the potential for a role as a transit point in the cocaine traffic between Peru, Bolivia and Colombia and the United States. During 1985 allegations have been received that U.S. backed Nicaraguan counterrevolutionaries known as "Contras" and based in Costa Rica in concert with anti-Castro Cuban elements in Miami have used their position in Costa Rica to facilitate the movement of cocaine through that country from Colombia to Miami. Profits were purportedly used to help finance their counterrevolutionary efforts in Nicaragua.

Recommendation

1. Good cooperation has traditionally existed between the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration Special Agents assigned to the Embassy in Costa Rica and the narcotic enforcement policy of that country. This Committee urges the DEA to intensify its efforts with the Costa Rican authorities to assist them in ensuring that their territory is not used by any organized group or individuals as a transit base for the smuggling of cocaine or any narcotic or psychotropic drugs to the United States.

NICARAGUA

Nicaragua has never been a traditional producer of any narcotic crops or a center for the illicit manufacture and traffic of narcotic drugs. Moreover, until the period 1983–84 there were no reports that Nicaragua was being utilized for the transit movement of drugs from South America to other countries, including the United States.

A former Nicaraguan Interior Minister has stated that the current Interior Minister Tomas Borge has been actively involved in smuggling cocaine from Colombia to the United States.

As a result of this type of report of drug trafficking activity, DEA conducted an investigation in 1984, which resulted in the indictment of 12 persons, including a Nicaraguan official, in the U.S. Court for the Southern District of Florida at Miami. Among those indicted in a conspiracy to smuggle cocaine from Colombia via Nicaragua were three of the most powerful drug traffickers in Colombia, Pablo Escobar, Carlos Lehder and Jorge Ochoa. The Nicaraguan official charged in the indictment is Frederico Vaughan, an aide to Nicaraguan Interior Minister Tomas Borge. To date four of the defendants in this prosecution have pled guilty, one was tried and found guilty. Six of the defendants, including Pablo Escobar, Carlos Lehder, Jorge Ochoa and Frederico Vaughan are fugitives. Jorge Ochoa is being held in Spain awaiting a decision on his extradition which was requested by the United States.

In December 1985 the Associated Press reported that Nicaraguan counter-revolutionary factions or "contra groups" have also been linked to narcotic trafficking activity. According to A. P. accounts, U.S. law enforcement officials and volunteers who work with the contra groups report that the contras operating in northern Costa Rica have engaged in cocaine trafficking in part to help finance their war against the Nicaraguan government. They allegedly refuel planes at clandestine air strips and transport cocaine to other points in Nicaragua for smuggling to the United States. The contra groups involved are the Nicaraguan Democratic Alliance (ARDE), as well as a splinter group known as M3. Sebastian Gonzales Mendiola, a leader of M3 was indicted in Costa Rica in 1984 for cocaine trafficking.

According to the Associated Press, one report circulating is that one of the ARDE top commandos loyal to ARDE leader Eden Pastora used cocaine profits during 1985 to buy a $250,000 arms shipment and a helicopter. Bosco Matamoros, an FDN spokesman in Washington, and Levy Sanchez, a Miami spokesman, have denied this allegation.

The Associated Press also reported that four American rebel supporters who trained contras in Costa Rican base camps said they discovered the contra smuggling involvement early in 1985, after Cuban Americans were recruited to help the Honduran based FDN open a Costa Rican front. They said two Cuban Americans used armed rebel troops to guard cocaine at clandestine airfields in northern Costa Rica. The Cuban Americans were identified as members of the 2506 Brigade, an anti-Castro group that participated in the 1961 Bay of Pigs attack on Cuba. Several of these rebel backers told the Associated Press they supplied information about this smuggling to U.S. investigators.

The Associated Press reported that an American rebel backer with close ties to the Cuban-American smugglers said that cocaine is unloaded from planes at rebel airstrips and taken to an Atlantic Coast port where it is concealed on shrimp boats for smuggling to Miami. The A.P. article also reported that a Nicaraguan rebel leader in Costa Rica told U.S. authorities that his group was being paid $50,000 to safeguard a 100 kilo shipment of cocaine transiting

Costa Rica from Colombia to the United States. The $50,000 was allegedly used for the cause of fighting the Sandinista government of Nicaragua.

Recommendations

There is evidence to conclude that individuals connected to both the Sandinista government of Nicaragua and one or more contra factions, have been involved in lucrative cocaine traffic directed at the United States.

1. The Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) should increase and intensify its efforts to investigate the extent to which Nicaragua might be used as a transit base for cocaine smuggling to the United States. Notwithstanding the strained relations between Nicaragua and the United States, appropriate cooperation under Article 35 of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs should be maintained between the two governments to fully investigate reported or suspected narcotic smuggling activity between the two countries.

2. The United States Government should ensure that any Nicaraguan Contra group that it supports does not engage in any narcotic smuggling or trafficking activity anywhere. Any such activity uncovered should be referred to DEA for prosecution by the appropriate authorities where it takes place.

BELIZE

This Central American nation emerged as a new and significant producer of high grade marijuana for smuggling to the United States in 1982. Cultivation in 1985 is reported to have dramatically increased over 1984. In recent years considerable parliamentary debate has taken place on the feasibility of eradicating illicit marijuana cultivation through the aerial spraying of herbicide.

During most of 1985 the Belize Government rejected aerial spraying on ecological and political grounds. Its manual eradication effort and marijuana seizures reportedly accounted for less than one percent of the crop. Finally, in October the Belize Government utilized the herbicide glyphosate to spray cultivation and brought eradication for the year up to 512 hectares. This amounted to 47 percent of the 1,092 hectares of marijuana cultivated.

The Belize Government reports satisfaction with the results of the glyphosate spray eradication program and plans to use it more intensively in 1986. Given the small size of Belize, the fact that cultivation is not yet extensive and it is not a traditional crop, a few years of effective eradication would discourage further cultivation.

The bulk of the marijuana smuggled from Belize to the United States is via small aircraft. This activity invites the utilization of Belize as a clandestine air transit route for the smuggling of cocaine from South America to the United States. There are reports that this is in fact underway and this concerns the Select Committee.

Recommendation

The State Department should assist the Government of Belize develop and implement a plan that would provide for the organized

and comprehensive eradication of illicit marijuana cultivation, the destruction of clandestine airfields and docking sites for loading smuggling aircraft and vessels. This would also prevent Belize from developing as an important air and marine smuggling route for cocaine from Colombia to the United States.

JAMAICA

It is estimated that 2,000 to 4,500 metric tons of marijuana were smuggled from Jamaica to the United States in 1985. About 7 percent of the marijuana entering the country originates in Jamaica. It ranks third as a supplier behind Colombia and Mexico. Additionally, estimates are about 2 metric tons of hashish and between 1 and 2 metric tons of hashish oil were smuggled to the United States.

Reports indicate that about 955 hectares of marijuana were eradicated in 1985. During 1984, Jamaican authorities estimated 10 percent of the crop was eradicated while in 1985 about 35 percent was destroyed.

As this Committee has previously reported Jamaica is also an important transit point for cocaine smuggling from Colombia. The Government provides reasonably good law enforcement cooperation to U.S. drug enforcement authorities in the development of narcotic investigations of mutual interest. Through the 1970's and until 1985, Jamaica for internal political reasons has been sporadic in eradicating illicit marijuana cultivation and seizing marijuana being trafficked. It has also not been effective in closing down clandestine airstrips and smuggling vessel loading sites.

In 1985 significant progress was made in marijuana eradication due to the persistent urging of the U.S. State Department and the Congress for this action. The media has supported this and has been critical of the government for not being more effective in preventing the smuggling of marijuana from Jamaica aboard the national airline and concealed in maritime cargo.

Recommendations

1. During 1985 Jamaica made a good start in its efforts to detect and measure the marijuana crop and using overland vehicles and helicopters and powered cutters eradicated a significant portion of the crop. These efforts should be expanded and the State Department should provide the necessary helicopters, aircraft, motor vehicles and power cutting equipment to enable the Jamaican authorities on an annual basis to detect and eradicate larger portions of the marijuana crop.

2. Recognizing that effective marijuana eradication may take 3 to 5 years to destroy the bulk of the crop and discourage farmers from continuing to plant, if faced with certain destruction, the Committee recommends that efforts to prevent the export of marijuana must be intensified. This can best be accomplished by shutting down the clandestine airstrips and docking sites used to land aircraft and vessels. The State Department should assist the Jamaican authorities with equipment and training which would enhance these efforts. This would also help prevent vessels and aircraft

smuggling marijuana and cocaine from Colombia using Jamaica as a transfer or transit stop in their operations.

3. The Drug Enforcement Administration should expand its operations in Jamaica in the way of developing joint criminal prosecution with the authorities against individuals smuggling marijuana and cocaine from Jamaica to the United States or using Jamaica as a transit base for these operations.

THE BAHAMAS

In 1985 the situation in the Bahamas remained essentially the same. It was consistent with the volume of smuggling of cocaine and marijuana by aircraft and motherships from Colombia and Jamaica to Florida. The volume of marijuana stayed about the same while indicators pointed to an increase in the traffic of cocaine.

The Bahamas archipelago, because of its geographic position, has historically been utilized by smugglers to penetrate the southern coast of the United States, particularly South Florida. In the island chain, airdrops or aircraft and mothership unloadings are made for transfer to high speed boats and light aircraft that make the final run swiftly into a Florida docking site, remote airstrip or airdrop site.

Recommendation

The Bahamas will continue to be a major springboard for the movement of marijuana and cocaine into the United States from South America until such time as the illicit production and traffic of those drugs is brought under control. In the meanwhile, a program of total cooperative joint operations with the Government of the Bahamas could substantially reduce this traffic while steps are taken to end illicit marijuana production in Jamaica and Colombia and coca and cocaine production in Peru, Bolivia and Colombia.

MEXICO

The following discussion of narcotics control efforts in Mexico draws upon the Select Committee's January 1986 visit to Mexico which concluded a week-long study mission along the U.S. southwest border.

The Committee arrived in Mexico City on Friday, January 17, 1986.

The United States cooperative narcotics control program with Mexico was described as consisting of: (1) eradication; (2) investigation; (3) public awareness; and support to interdiction efforts.

There are serious problems in the drug control efforts in Mexico. Operation Vanguard, a comprehensive narcotics crop eradication program, is finally being implemented after much delay. A public awareness campaign has been initiated to stress drug abuse prevention. A countrywide aerial survey of Mexico's drug production is scheduled to begin in February 1986.

In spite of these signs of progress, there is still much more that needs to be done to achieve a successful drug eradication program in Mexico. Stressed as crucial to a successful drug program is eliminating corruption at all levels of government in Mexico.

In addition, the various units of the Mexican government involved in the drug effort need to be better coordinated. The responsibility for that, ultimately, is with the central government of Mexico, which must coordinate, not only the various Federal agencies, but also the regional and local agencies that contribute to Mexico's narcotics control effort.

A general "lack of cooperation" on the part of Mexicans involved in the many aspects of the drug fight was cited as a major stumbling block to joint narcotics control efforts. The continuous opposition to placing U.S. observers in Mexican eradication and aerial survey flights, dilution of herbicides made available for crop eradication and lapses in the care of the equipment made available by the U.S. for eradication are evidence of this. One example of the Mexican lack of attention toward drug control efforts was the failure, before a hurricane, to secure a helicopter used in eradication. This negligence resulted in the loss of that helicopter.

It is believed that corruption and the fear it breeds are the major reasons why so many Mexicans are not effective in their cooperative drug enforcement efforts with the U.S. In addition, the Mexican law enforcement departments lack manpower, training and resources, resulting in general inefficiency.

With as much as an estimated 42 percent of the heroin, 35 percent of the marijuana and 33 percent of the cocaine consumed in the U.S. being either cultivated in or trafficked through Mexico, the U.S. cannot afford to lessen its vigilance of the drug efforts within Mexico.

U.S. officials stress the need for Mexico to increase and intensify eradiction in the major production centers. In 1985, Mexico claimed to have eradicated 5,660 hectares of opium. The U.S. estimates it is closer to 2,600 hectares. The discrepancy is said to be caused by duplication by the Mexicans of eradication projects and double counting.

Marijuana eradication was put at 2,900 hectares by the Mexican government. Again, U.S. intelligence indicates that much less was, in fact, eradicated. The DEA estimated that during the first six months of 1985, 897 hectares were eradicated. While no figure is available yet, they estimate that eradication during the second six months was even less as a result of damage done to eradication equipment (planes and helicopters) during the earthquake and hurricane.

U.S. intelligence estimates are that in 1985, Mexico cultivated 5,200 hectares of opium and 9,000 hectares of marijuana.

Recommendations

1. When this Committee visited Mexico in August 1983, it reported that "estimates of the percentage of heroin supplied to the United States from Mexico from 1979 through 1983 were between 30 and 40 percent." This was a period of time when all indicators pointed to an upswing in overall heroin availability, largely due to increasing supplies from southwest Asia, particularly Pakistan.

It noted that Mexico has maintained its 30 to 40 percent share of a steadily expanding volume of heroin in the United States since 1979. Following progressive annual increases in poppy eradication from 1976 through 1978, this leveled off in 1979. From that point

on it is thought the Government of Mexico had not been able to annually increase the percentage of the opium crop eradicated. There are reports that from 1979 opium production in Mexico on an annual basis increased gradually as growers moved to widely dispersed small plots.

The Committee recommended that "the Department of State assist the Government of Mexico develop, as soon as possible the capability to survey the extent of opium and marijuana production in its territory via high altitude aircraft or satellite." This would be for the purpose of detecting and pinpointing cultivation for eradication, verification of destruction and measuring whether production is increasing or decreasing annually and how much may be actually produced.

The Committee learned that no steps were taken by the Department of State with the Government of Mexico to implement or even consider this recommendation until late in 1985 when arrangements were made to begin an aerial survey operation in February 1986. In the intervening two years of inaction of developing an aerial survey and detection system, indicators pointed to increasing opium production and a dramatic explosion in marijuana cultivation. By 1981, Mexico's share of the illicit marijuana traffic to the United States dropped to about four percent. In 1982 it increased to six percent; in 1983 to eleven percent; in 1984 to fifteen percent; and in 1985 to 25 percent. An aerial survey organized in 1983 as recommended could have done much to prevent these dramatic increases in opium and marijuana production in Mexico now affecting the United States.

The Committee is pleased with the start that now has been made to assist Mexico develop a narcotic crop aerial survey and recommends that the Department of State assign the highest priority to assisting the Government of Mexico develop a "high tech" capability to survey the extent of opium and marijuana production in its territory via high altitude aircraft or satellite. This would be for the purpose of detecting and pinpointing cultivation for eradication, verfication of destruction and measuring whether production is increasing or decreasing annually and how much may be actually produced.

2. Following its 1983 visit to Mexico, the Committee recommended in its report that "the Department of State should determine as soon as possible whether the number of helicopters, particularly the 33 Bell 206 helicopters used for eradication, were sufficient in number to enable the Mexican Attorney General's Office to begin again to progressively eliminate on an annual basis a greater percentage of the opium poppy crop. It recognized that through an effective aerial survey of production they could better identify poppy fields and that would make for a more effective utilization of the eradication aircraft. However, it just might be that more Bell 206 helicopters were needed to increase eradication effectiveness and a determination on this should be made."

The Committee has learned that this determination was never made. A dichotomy continues between the leadership of the Mexican Attorney General's aerial eradication unit and the Embassy's Narcotic Assistance Unit (NAU) on the question of whether the aviation unit has sufficient aircraft to effectively eradicate the

poppy and marijuana crop. The Mexicans take the position that they do not. The Embassy NAU position is that if the aviation unit utilized its equipment more fully and effectively, it would have no need for any additional helicopters. Recently agreement was reached where the aviation unit would adopt recommendations for fuller and more efficient utilization of existing helicopters. If this proves adequate to getting the job done, no additional helicopters will be provided for the present. If it is concluded that more helicopters are needed, they would be provided. While the Mexican aviation unit concedes that improvements in the effective use of existing equipment can always be made, it remains convinced that more helicopters are needed.

The Committee recommends and urges the Department of State and Embassy at Mexico City to ensure that the Mexican Attorney General's Office is utilizing its eradication program helicopters at maximum effectiveness and is once again effectively eliminating each year a larger percentage of the poppy and marijuana crop than the previous year. If additional helicopters are needed to make the progressive elimination of narcotic crop production in Mexico possible, they should be provided as rapidly as possible. Opium poppy and marijuana production in Mexico stands exposed and vulnerable to aerial detection and eradication for months at a time. Destruction of these narcotic crops is the most certain and cost effective means of preventing drug trafficking and abuse the should be assigned the highest priority.

The United States and Mexican Governments must together at the highest levels ensure that sufficient manpower, equipment and operational funding is provided to ensure that the Mexican aerial detection, eradication and verification force has the means to eradicate or threaten the eradication of the entire poppy and marijuana crop in Mexico.

3. When the Committee visited Mexico in August 1983, it learned that narcotic enforcement cooperation extended to the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), assigned to the Embassy and Consulates in Mexico, by the Mexican Federal Judicial Police (MFJP) during the last 18 months of the Lopez Portillo administration (July 1981 to December 1982) had been ineffective, if not nonexistent. This is a situation that should not have been permitted to exist more than a few weeks, let alone a year and a half. It does not appear to be a coincidence that during the period of time where there was a breakdown in cooperation between the MJFP and DEA that a marked increase in the availability of Mexican heroin developed in the United States. The Committee was told in August 1983 that with inauguration of the de la Madrid administration, cooperation between the MFJP and the DEA returned to normal by early 1983.

In its report covering the 1983 visit, the Committee recommended that as an important first step the concept of joint narcotics prosecutions, known as the "JANUS" should be reactivated. The concept provides for exchanging narcotic evidence, witnesses and testimony to prosecute important narcotic violators in one country on the basis of the evidence that can be gathered in both countries or third countries. The Committee believed that a series of cases could be initiated to exploit existing evidence that could be used to

prosecute and convict major sources of supply, heroin laboratory operators and the financial backers of the traffic in Mexico and the United States.

The Committee has learned that not even a start had been made in developing any effective prosecutions in Mexico with the MFJP on the basis of evidence available in the United States through the DEA.

Again, in its report covering the 1983 visit, the Committee stated, "In Mexico it is not enough for the government to just eradicate the opium and marijuana crops. A vigorous joint narcotic enforcement effort by the MFJP assisted by DEA is needed to develop important heroin arrests and seizures in the traffic directed toward the United States. Clandestine heroin laboratories should be confiscated on a regular basis. The MFJP and DEA should also work together to prevent international traffickers from using Mexico as a transit base to smuggle heroin of European and Asiatic origin, cocaine and psychotropic drugs to the United States because of the ease with which they can penetrate the United States 2,000 mile border with Mexico.

The Committee has confirmed that no progress had been made by the DEA and MFJP to effectively address the trafficking of heroin and marijuana of Mexican origin and as much as 30 to 35 percent of the cocaine traffic from South America that is directed at the United States via the major Mexican narcotic trafficking organizations. This almost total lack of effective and meaningful cooperation by the MFJP with DEA was highlighted during 1985 at Guadalajara by the kidnapping, torture and brutal murder of DEA Special Agent Enrique Camarena and Alfredo Zaval Avelar, a Mexican aircraft pilot who had been working with him.

Sadly, there are credible allegations that members of the MFJP as well as the Mexican Security Police were corrupted into participating in this heinous crime by a conspiracy of major drug traffickers.

While hundreds of courageous narcotics enforcement officers worldwide have been killed in performance of their duties attempting to arrest violators, raid premises and seize drugs, this is the first time an officer has ever been kidnapped, tortured and murdered simply because he was a narcotics enforcement officer.

The MFJP is the agency responsible for investigating the Camarena murder in concert with what is known under the "Napoleonic Code" system of law as an "instructional judge" or "investigating magistrate." Under the supervision of the Mexican Attorney General, the instructional judge using the MFJP as his investigators is assigned to prepare a case that would identify, implicate, charge and prosecute the perpetrators of the Camarena and Zaval murders.

The MFJP and the Mexican Magistrates or Judges who have persistently failed to develop important narcotic prosecutions, notwithstanding the availability of evidence, are failing to develop up until now at least a prosecution that will identify all of the conspirators and bring them to justice. If this cannot be done, there is little or no hope that the MFJP and the Mexican Federal judicial system will ever be able to develop an effective narcotic enforcement program.

The Committee recommends that the United States Attorney General and the Mexican Attorney General increase and intensify the efforts they have already initiated to bring the narcotic enforcement cooperation of the DEA and the MFJP to an acceptable performance level. The U.S. Attorney General in every way possible should assist the Mexican Attorney General in the latter's efforts to develop an effective "instructional judge or magistrate system" that would provide for bringing to prosecution cases such as the Camarena murder and major narcotic conspiracies on a routine basis.

4. This Committee has long been concerned with the inability of the United States Government in cooperation with the Government of Mexico to develop any meaningful system or program that would provide for the investigation and prosecution of important and major narcotic traffickers in Mexico responsible for the traffic directed at the United States. Investigative leads sent from the United States are reportedly not effectively followed up by the MFJP, and the MFJP has never devised or implemented procedures to use evidence and witnesses developed and available in the United States to prosecute Mexican violators in Mexico. The excuse most often cited for this failure is the difference of our legal or judicial systems: Anglo-Saxon law versus the Napoleonic Code. Closer examination, however, indicates that this should not be the case because for 35 years the United States has been developing joint narcotics prosecutions with Italy, France, Spain, Belgium, The Netherlands, The Federal Republic of Germany, and Switzerland, all of which essentially have the same system of law as Mexico. The U.S.-Mexican failure to develop a similar formula of effective narcotic prosecutorial cooperation is one of implementation, not legal conflict.

To correct this, the Committee recommends that the United States and Mexico organize two small units, one in Mexico City and one in Washington, D.C. They each would be staffed by a small number of MFJP investigators and Mexican instructional judges or magistrates, plus DEA Special Agents and U.S. Department of Justice Attorneys. The unit in Mexico City would be supervised by a Mexican official and the office at Washington, obviously, by a U.S. official. Each office utilizing its binational expertise would oversee the collection and preparation of evidence and testimony for transmittal for prosecution purposes to the other country.

VENEZUELA

Traditionally Venezuela has been known for its effective Police National Guard and Customs narcotics enforcement efforts. Notwithstanding the fact that it shares a large frontier with Colombia, bordering on a major marijuana producing area of the latter country, Venezuela has prevented its territory from being used to any significant extent for illicit production and traffic spilling over from Colombia.

However, in 1985 Venezuelan authorities reported finding marijuana cultivation in the Perija Mountains along the northwestern border with Colombia. The Colombian side of the border is perhaps the largest marijuana growing area in the country known as the

Serrania Perija. The plots measured one to five hectares in size and were destroyed by the Venezuelan National Guard.

The Venezuelan authorities also report the detection and seizure of abandoned cocaine laboratory sites with an overall capacity to produce multi-ton quantities of cocaine. They also report that cocaine is being smuggled to the United States via private aircraft in 50 to 200 kilo shipments. Marijuana is being transshipped to Colombia for loading on Colombian flag vessels at local ports for smuggling to the United States.

The organized illicit production and traffic of marijuana and cocaine in Venezuela is estimated to be comprised of 80 percent Colombian, 10 percent Venezuelan and the remainder other nationalities.

Recommendations

The Government of Venezuela is commended by this Committee for the high priority it assigns to suppressing illicit narcotic production and trafficking in its territory and for the leadership role and initiative it has taken in furthering international narcotics control through the United Nations and other international organizations.

1. This Committee recommends that Venezuela maintain constant vigilance as the best means to prevent its territory from being used for the illicit production and traffic of marijuana, coca and cocaine.

2. This Committee also believes that, given the effectiveness of the Venezuelan narcotic enforcement agencies and criminal justice system, investigative operations with DEA should be increased and intensified to share evidence and develop more major prosecutions against the major trafficking organizations operating in Venezuela in the cocaine traffic from South America directed at the United States.

A National Drug Enforcement Strategy

The National Drug Enforcement Policy Board should direct the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), pursuant to its mandate as the statutory or "lead agency" in drug enforcement, to develop in concert with the other two Federal agencies with a statutory role in drug smuggling suppression, Customs and Coast Guard, a comprehensive enforcement strategy to prevent the smuggling of narcotic and psychotropic drugs into the United States via our land, sea and air borders.

In recent years cooperation between State and local police and narcotic enforcement units and the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) and Customs and Coast Guard has increased and grown in effectiveness. This has developed as a result of the enormous expansion of the drug smuggling and trafficking problem across the length and breadth of the country. However, the expansion of drug trafficking and abuse nationwide has outstripped the resources of the concerned Federal, State and local agencies and has brought a need for a more structured coordination of operational responsibility to effectively address drug trafficking under our Federal System.

This creates a need for a combined effort on the part of the Federal, State and local drug enforcement agencies to prepare and provide for the implementation of a "national narcotics enforcement strategy."

Traditionally, State and local agencies, at best in a rather informal way, almost as a courtesy have been kept informed of what the Federal drug enforcement strategy is. Federal, State and local narcotic enforcement agencies on a need basis have cooperated in developing specific investigations or joined forces in task force programs.

This Committee now recommends that through appropriate representation State and local narcotic enforcement entities participate in the preparation of a comprehensive strategy that they would implement in concert with the Federal Government. Other Federal agencies with an ancillary or support role in drug enforcement would, of course, participate in the preparation of the strategy on an ad hoc basis. This would include the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (BATF), the Navy, Air Force, Army, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and any other agency or department deemed appropriate.

This would ensure that under our system of Federal, State and local jurisdiction that the United States meets the requirements of Article 35, paragraph (a), of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961: "Make arrangements at the national level for coordination of preventive and repressive action against the illicit traffic; to this end they may designate an appropriate agency responsible for such coordination." Article 21, paragraph (a), of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971 carries the same requirement.

This Committee recommends the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board form a "United States Drug Enforcement Strategy Committee" around DEA as the lead agency to provide for the preparation and implementation of a national enforcement strategy through a coordinated Federal, State and local effort that would more effectively assign responsibility and provide for cooperation in joint operations as well as support for each entity in its area of jurisdiction.

ACTIVITIES

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

DRUG ABUSE AND DRUG TRAFFICKING IN CHICAGO

(MAY 31 AND JUNE 1)

Witnesses:

May 31, 1985

Honorable Harold Washington, Mayor, City of Chicago.

Patrick F. Healy, Executive Director, Chicago Crime Commission.

Peter B. Bensinger, Director, Chicago Crime Commission.

Fred Rice, Superintendent, Chicago Police Department.

Kenneth Wadas, Supervisor, Narcotics Unit Assistant State's Attorney.

Robert Taylor, Director, Metropolitan Enforcement Group, Illinois Department of Law Enforcement.

Michael E. Fryzel, Director, Illinois Department of Financial Institutions.

Georgia K. Marsh, Supervisor, Currency Exchange Division.

Philip Fisher, Special Agent-In-Charge, Chicago Division, Drug Enforcement Administration.

Edward Hegarty, Special Agent-In-Charge, Chicago Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Anton Valukas, U.S. Attorney for Northern Illinois.

Warren Harrison, Assistant Regional Commissioner for Criminal Investigation, Midwest Region, Internal Revenue Service, Chicago, Illinois.

David Ripa, Assistant Regional Commissioner for Enforcement, U.S. Customs.

June 1, 1985

Edward T. Duffy, Director of the Illinois Department of Alcohol and Substance Abuse.

Dr. Edward Senay, University of Chicago.

Melody M. Heaps, Executive Director, Treatment Alternatives to Street Crimes (TASC) Inc.

Peter J. Bokos, Executive Director, Interventions.

Allen Land, Cathedral Shelter of Chicago.

Dr. Daniel Hendershott, Central States Institute of Addictions.

Gerald J. Heing, Assistant Superintendent, Department of Curriculum, Chicago Public Schools.

Peter Hunt, Executive Director, Chicago Area Project.

On May 31 and June 1, 1985, the Committee held a hearing to examine the extent of drug abuse and drug trafficking in that city. Among the issues raised were the scope of heroin and cocaine abuse in Chicago, the involvement of the street gangs in drug dealing, the laundering of drug profits through Chicago area banks and financial institutions, and drug abuse prevention and treatment activities.

This hearing helped to spotlight how extensive drug trafficking and drug abuse has become in Chicago. Hospital emergency room mentions involving cocaine have nearly quadrupled from 125 in 1980 to 459 in 1984, while the number of heroin cases has almost doubled in the same period from 226 in 1980 to 436 in 1984. The dramatic escalation of both cocaine and heroin abuse has placed an undue strain on the ability of Chicago area drug abuse treatment agencies to provide drug treatment and other medical assistance to those who desire such help. Waiting lists are commonplace for both heroin and cocaine treatment services.

Brown heroin, the "Mexican Connection", is still the source of most heroin on the streets of Chicago; however, an increasing amount of white, Southwest Asian heroin is being brought into the city. Most of the cocaine seen in Chicago is brought in from Florida or other points in the South.

Mayor Harold Washington appeared as the lead witness at the hearing. He told the Committee that:

> There is a need for local law enforcement officials to spend millions of dollars, which we do not have, trying to combat drug abuse, domestic violence, and a host of many other social problems and social disorganization outflows from the use of drugs, or from the motivation for the use of drugs.

The Mayor went on to state:

> There are some places in our city where the selling of narcotics is a curb-service operation. Cars pull up to the curb and individuals sell customers any number of narcotics. It is estimated that these narcotic curb-service operations make thousands of dollars a day in the trafficking of drugs. Our overworked police make arrests all year long at these curb-service operations, yet they continue to exist and to flourish.

The street gangs have emerged as major distribution networks for drugs in Chicago. Police Superintendent Fred Rice told the Select Committee, ". . . their (the street gangs) role is not limited to the street, but rather it transcends the entire spectrum of trafficking. The sale of narcotics has been a significant source of income for many gangs, enabling them to finance their various activities." Patrick Healy informed the Committee that the calls received by Crime Commission's "Report Crime in Your Neighborhood" program are predominantly of "drugs and gangs." Effective action against the gang problem is needed if Chicago is to significantly reduce the availability of drugs on its streets.

An important area the Select Committee uncovered in this hearing is the existence of numerous loopholes in the Illinois state criminal code that hampers the ability of state law enforcement agencies to more aggressively combat drug trafficking and drug related crimes. Illinois lacks an eavesdropping law which would permit the nonconsensual eavesdropping in criminal cases based on probable cause, and stronger laws that would forfeit to the State the illegal profits of convicted drug dealers. A recommendation was also made for a law giving the state a right to a jury trial in crimi-

nal cases. Chairman Rangel wrote Illinois Governor James Thompson on July 10, 1985 expressing support of these measures.

Money laundering was an important area of discussion with the Federal witnesses, as well as state banking officials. While the Committee was pleased to learn that the laundering of drug money through neighborhood currency exchanges, the subject of a committee investigation and hearing in 1979, has been successfully combatted through state laws, the Federal witnesses warned of increasingly sophisticated methods by drug traffickers to launder their profits and move illicit gains out of the country. This fact makes all financial institutions vulnerable to drug traffickers. The Select Committee announced at the hearing that it would closely monitor legislative proposals that would strengthen our Federal money laundering statutes to have a more effective attack on the financial base of the drug trade.

One issue that was highlighted at the hearing was the high dropout rate among Chicago high school students—much of which is attributed to drug use by students, as well as to drug dealing and gang violence around Chicago schools. City officials told the committee that 50 percent of the blacks and Hispanics, and 35 percent of the whites who enter our high school system drop out before completion. The Committee announced it would explore the development of innovative programs to stop this immense depletion of students and their talents from the schools.

This hearing pointed to the many problems Chicago as most major U.S. cities face because of drug abuse and drug trafficking. Law enforcement officials drug abuse treatment and prevent professionals, and educators all are in need of increased resources to combat the many social problems drug abuse creates. Most state and local witnesses expressed support for H.R. 526, the "State and Local Narcotics Control Assistance Act of 1985." This legislation will provide $750 million per year over the next five years to assist state and local governments in drug law enforcement and treatment and prevention activities.

COCAINE ABUSE AND THE FEDERAL RESPONSE (JULY 16)

Witnesses:

Stacy Keach, Actor.

Carl Eller, former National Football League Player.

Bernice Carrington, Washington, D.C. Bank Employee.

Dr. Arnold Washton, Research Director, National Cocaine Helpline.

Dr. Ronald Dougherty, Benjamin Rush Psychiatric Center.

Richard Hamilton, Director, Drug Abuse Administration, Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene.

Dr. James O. Mason, Acting Assistant Secretary for Health, Department of Health and Human Services.

Dr. Donald Ian Macdonald, Administrator, Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

Marvin Snyder, Director of Preclinical Research, National Institute on Drug Abuse, Department of Health and Human Services.

This hearing was called to explore the cocaine epidemic sweeping the United States and the response of the Federal health establishment to the problem. In his opening remarks Chairman Rangel noted that the number of cocaine related deaths nationwide increased from 192 in 1979–1980, to 456 in 1983–1984. Hospital emergency rooms mentions involving cocaine increased by 300 percent between 1978 and 1983. Mr. Rangel further noted that the United States could expect increased amounts of cocaine to be smuggled into the United States in the years ahead.

Mr. Gilman, in his opening statement, made reference to the fact that there are an estimated 25 million users of cocaine in the United States, and an estimated 5,000 people try cocaine for the first time each day. He also stated that recent surveys showed that 16 percent of high school seniors reported trying cocaine—almost double the amount reporting trying the drug in 1975.

The first panel of witnesses were a group of former cocaine users. It included two "celebrities"—Actor Stacy Keach and former Minnesota Vikings Football player Carl Eller. The panel also was joined by Bernice Carrington, presently an employee of a financial institution in Washinton, D.C.

Just prior to his appearance before the Select Committee, actor Keach had just been released from prison in England where he had served a six month sentence for possession of cocaine. Mr. Keach told the committee that "It wasn't until I was apprehended at Heathrow Airport that the shock of recognition finally jolted me into realizing that the drug was controlling me, and not vice versa, and that I was helplessly at its mercy." Prior to that Keach said that he felt that he could control his use of cocaine. However, he said that this was "one of the hallmarks of cocaine's destructive power. It always deludes the user into feeling that he or she is in complete control until it is too late."

In Stacy Keach's view the two major thrusts to combat drug abuse are prevention through education, and rehabilitation through recognition. He called for increased Federal support for prevention and treatment programs.

Carl Eller was a defensive end for the Minnesota Vikings for 16 years. He told the Committee that at one time he was one of the higher paid defensive lineman in the National Football League at a salary of $100,000 and that for a period of approximately two years his entire salary was going to purchase drugs, including cocaine. Eller strongly felt that society penalizes the athlete, particularly the drug-abusing athlete. In his view the reponsibility of being a "role-model" of youth is thrust upon athletes without giving them the support, training and responsibility for handling this responsibility. Further, according to Eller, because they are not taught to deal with this responsibility, athletes are less willing to seek help for drug-related problems. Not only would seeking help run counter to the role-model status, but hinder sports career advancement as well.

Mr. Eller offered the following recommendations to the Committee to reduce the level of drug abuse among athletes:

(1) Establish a chapter of the United States Athletes Association (USAA) in every high school, college and university in the country.

(2) Teach athletes the "law of sports": prepare for early retirement, learn how to maintain your mind and body at optimum fitness, put sports into perspective.

(3) Establish a college curriculum that will educate the athlete in the areas of: financial planning and responsibility, leadership, how to meet and respond to the public, life balancing, and the principles of stress management.

(4) Professional teams should prepare plans for retired athletes to have productive careers after sports.

(5) A National Institute on Sports and the Humanities should be established as a think tank for coaches and athletic administrators to research the moral and ethical issues of professional sports.

(6) Professional athletes should have membership on all policy and rule-making boards that have authority over them and their careers.

Bernice Carrington reviewed the 9 years history of her addiction for the committee. She credits the availability of drug abuse treatment and her faith in God for helping her overcome drug use. She stated that, "I am a productive person in society today, because I stay close to these programs".

Ms. Carrington stated that, "Cocaine allowed me to be anything, do anything I wanted to do. I was completely powerless. The compulsion was very great".

All three witnesses under questioning from the Committee emphasized the importance of drug abuse education in the schools to combat drug abuse. Ms. Carrington added that in-school programs must be supported by community-based efforts when school is out and during vacation periods.

Mr. Keach emphasized that the problem of drug abuse in the entertainment industry is no greater than in the nation at large. He and Mr. Eller agreed that it would be wrong to single out any particular industry or profession in the fight against drug abuse. They urged a societal approach to the problem.

The next panel was composed of a group of cocaine treatment specialists and researchers: Dr. Arnold Washton, Research Director of the National Cocaine Helpline; Dr. Ronald Dougherty of the Benjamin Rush Psychyatric Center of Syracuse, New York; and Richard Hamilton, Director of the Drug Abuse Administration of the Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene.

Dr. Washton told the committee that the national helpline receives over 1,200 calls a day from cocaine users, with no tapering off in sight. He stated that as many as 2 to 3 million Americans are seriously addicted to cocaine. Washton said that cocaine, "knows no social or economic boundaries and has become the drug of choice of America's middle class and is well on its way to becoming the drug of choice of America's working and lower classes". He felt that one of the great dangers of cocaine abuse is that many Americans still view it as a harmless drug.

Moreover, according to Washton, cocaine is a powerful reinforcing drug. He said, "Users cannot limit their use, can't refuse it when it is offered, and seem to prefer cocaine to food, sex, recreational activities." He described the cocaine high as being very brief—lasting only 20 to 30 minutes—and replaced by a very unpleasant reaction known as the cocaine crash. "To stay high you

have got to take it once every half hour, and to ward off the unpleasant effects that soon follow, you have to repeatedly dose yourself", he added.

Washton described the medical consequences of cocaine abuse, including; severe sleep problems, chronic fatigue, cough and sore throat, brain seizures, and cardiac arrest. Psychiatric consequences range from unrelenting depression, irritability, difficulty concentrating, loss of sex drive, panic attacks, and suicide.

Washton mentioned increased media and advertising efforts, and school based prevention programs as two important elements in the fight against cocaine abuse.

Dr. Dougherty painted a bleak picture of those he sees in treatment for cocaine abuse. He cited cases ranging from violent attacks on others by cocaine uses who later cannot recall the incident, blackouts, sexual dysfunctions, neuropathy, and damage or destruction to the nasal septum. Death from cocaine use can be caused by cardiac arrest and brain seizures. Dr. Dougherty told the Committee of severe problems to newborns as a result of their mothers using cocaine during pregnancy, including mental and motor retardation.

Richard Hamilton addressed the cocaine problem from the drug abuse service delivery perspective. He criticized the Federal government for staying out of the cocaine treatment picture. He noted that at the time cocaine abuse started to grow, the Federal Government reduced support to the states for drug abuse programs by the implementation of the block grant program.

Hamilton told the Committee that the explosion in cocaine use in all segments of society has created a pool of people who are seeking treatment for cocaine use. However, there are not enough treatment services to handle the needs of those who are seeking treatment. He noted that "In Maryland, the average waiting time is 42 days for entering into treatment."

The last panel of witnesses were representatives from the Department of Health and Human Services. They were the Assistant Secretary for Health, Dr. James O. Mason; the Administrator of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA), Dr. Ian Macdonald; and the Director of Preclinical Research for the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), Marvin Snyder.

While concurring in the fact that cocaine use had reached new heights, Dr. Mason stated that, "Our most recent surveys indicate that the number of new cocaine have begun to level off. At least among those under 26, and many young people are reporting increased awareness of the negative consequences associated with the drugs."

Dr. Mason told the Committee that adverse health effects of cocaine do not always occur with the first use of the drug. "Consequently," he stated, "it is necessary to contrast the trends in cocaine use with the trends in medical emergencies and demand for treatment. It is not at all surprising that even though the most recent surveys of prevalence of use indicate that the number of new cocaine users has leveled off—at least among those under 26—the impact of the dramatic increases in cocaine use in the late 1970's is becoming more and more visible in terms of demand for

treatment of dependence and medical crises associated with cocaine use."

Dr. Mason stated that NIDA is devoting an increasing proportion of it resources to research aimed at understanding how cocaine works, what its effects are, who abuses cocaine, and what treatment prevention approaches are most efficacious in dealing with cocaine use. He pointed to the publication of NIDA monographs, working with the World Health Organization, conducting symposiums and other NIDA efforts in the cocaine area.

With regards to prevention, Dr. Mason announced that NIDA recently signed a contract with the Advertising Council to launch a multi-media advertising campaign to combat drug abuse.

Mr. Rangel inquired of the Federal witnesses the role of the Federal Government in drug abuse education and prevention in American communities. He criticized the lack of a visible Federal presence in drug abuse demand reduction activities, and faulted ADAMHA and NIDA for failing to take a lead role in these areas. Mr. Coughlin agreed with the thrusts of Chairman Rangel's remarks and urged the witnesses that they should insure that information on cocaine abuse gets into every school in America.

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL (SEPTEMBER 12)

Witness:

Jon R. Thomas, Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics Matters.

On September 12, 1985, the Select Committee held a hearing on international narcotics control. The thrust of the hearing was a report from the State Department on the status of our narcotics control programs in drug producing nations, particularly in South America.

Jon R. Thomas, Assistant Secretary for the Bureau of International Narcotics Matters was the witness for the State Department. He was accompanied by Deputy Assistant Secretaries Mark Dion and Ann Wrobleski.

Mr. Thomas addressed five dimensions of international narcotics control that are impacting U.S efforts. They are: the "internationalization" of the narcotics problem, the impact of U.S. domestic eradication efforts on foreign relations, the national drug enforcement policy, economic sanctions, and bilateral agreements.

There has been a dramatic change in the narcotics control field, according to Mr. Thomas. He told the Select Committee that concern over narcotics has now become universal—there has been an "internationalization" of the drug problem. This growing concern is in large part due to the recognition by governments, from developed and less-developed nations, that the illicit production, trafficking and abuse of drugs pose serious threats to their development, their societies, and in some cases, to their national security.

Mr. Thomas indicated that there is a relationship between the national strategy and international efforts—what we do at home is scrutinized abroad. He asserted that the U.S. is setting an example in the area of crop eradication. Our commitment at home is being recognized increasingly.

Abroad, the U.S. is supporting crop eradication programs in 14 countries.

Mr. Thomas reported that drug policy coordination among Federal agencies is improving. The National Drug Enforcement Policy Board is insuring that issues having broad policy and program implications are considered at both the Cabinet and subcabinet levels. He indicated that the drug issue has the attention of Secretary of State Shultz and Attorney General Meese.

Chairman Rangel took issue with Mr. Thomas' assessment of the priority given the narcotics issue by the Administration. Mr. Rangel inquired as to the frequency of the meetings between Mr. Thomas and Secretary Shultz on the narcotics issue, the number of trips abroad made by the Secretary which relate specifically with international narcotics production, and the frequency of meetings between the President and Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Rangel indicated that the Select Committee was impressed by the fact that the First Lady was reaching out in a very dramatic way on the drug issue, but concluded that if the President has similarly reached out his efforts have gone unnoticed.

DRUG ABUSE AND DRUG TRAFFICKING IN NEW ENGLAND

(SEPTEMBER 20 AND 21, 1985)

Witnesses:

Friday, September 20

Honorable Michael S. Dukakis, Governor of Massachusetts.

Charles Barry, Secretary of Public Safety, Massachusetts.

Frank Trabucco, Commissioner of Public Safety, Massachusetts.

Frederick W. Riley, Assistant Attorney General, Chief, Criminal Bureau, Massachusetts.

Stephen E. Merrill, Attorney General, New Hampshire.

Colonel Allan Weeks, Chief, Maine State Police.

Charles Hachadorian, Jr., Drug Control Administrator, Division of Drug Control, State Department of Health, Rhode Island.

Commissioner Francis M. Roache, Boston Police Department.

Lieutenant Rudy Legenza, Detective, Central Falls, Rhode Island, Police Department, accompanied by Detective Michael White.

Chief Thomas Leahy, Worcester, Massachusetts, Police Department.

William F. Weld, United States Attorney, District of Massachusetts.

Allan H. Nevas, United States Attorney, District of Connecticut.

Richard S. Cohen, United States Attorney, District of Maine.

Lincoln C. Almond, United States Attorney, District of Rhode Island.

Paul Brown, Assistant-In-Charge, Boston Field Office, Drug Enforcement Administration.

James W. Greenleaf, Special Agent-In-Charge, Boston Field Office, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Commodore Robert L. Johansen, USCG, Commander, First Coast Guard District.

Donald S. Donohue, Assistant Regional Commissioner (Enforcement), Northeast Region, U.S. Customs Service.

Bruce Milburn, Assistant Regional Commissioner (Criminal Investigation), North Atlantic Region, Internal Revenue Service.

Saturday, September 21

Honorable Raymond L. Flynn, Mayor, City of Boston.

Thomas P. Salmon, Director, Division of Drug Rehabilitation, Massachusetts.

Geraldine Sylvester, Director, Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention, New Hampshire.

William Pimentel, Assistant Director, Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Hospitals, Division of Substance Abuse Prevention, Rhode Island.

Jack Pransky, Substance Abuse Prevention Program Specialist, Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs, Vermont.

Nathaniel Askia, Executive Director; Mr. Locksley Bryan, Chairman, F.I.R.S.T. Inc., Dorchester, Massachusetts.

David Mactas, Executive Director, Marathon House, Providence, R.I., and President, Therapeutic Communities of America.

William J. Hartigan, Vice President, Alcohol and Substance Abuse Division, The Mediplex Group, Inc., Newton, Massachusetts, and President, Alcohol and Drug Problems Association of North America.

Thomas Kosten, M.D., Assistant Professor of Psychiatry, and Associate Director, Substance Abuse Treatment Unit, Yale University.

Otto Moulton, Danvers, Massachusetts; Member, Board of Directors, National Federation of Parents for Drug-Free Youth.

Joan Green, MEd.; Matt Green, MEd., Newton, Massachusetts, School Department, Newton Youth Drug/Alcohol Program.

Georgette Watson, founder, Drop-a-Dime Program, Roxbury, Massachusetts.

Newman Flanagan, District Attorney, Suffolk County, Massachusetts.

Kevin Burke, District Attorney, Essex County, Massachusetts.

Scott Harshbarger, District Attorney, Middlesex County, Massachusetts.

Philip Rollins, District Attorney, Barnstable County, Massachusetts.

Ronald A. Pina, District Attorney, Bristol County, Massachusetts.

Anthony J. Ruberto, District Attorney, Berkshire County, Massachusetts.

On Friday, September 20, and Saturday, September 21, 1985, the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control held hearings in Boston, Massachusetts, on drug abuse and drug trafficking in the New England region. The Select Committee went to Boston at the request of Congressman Joseph Moakley (D-MA) who participated in the hearing and who had received reports of widespread drug trafficking and abuse in Massachusetts, and throughout the six New England States. The Committee was honored that Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Speaker, United States House of Representatives was able to participate in these hearings. Other Congressmen present for the hearings were Charles B. Rangel, Chairman, Select Committee on Narcotics, Benjamin A. Gilman, Ranking Minority Member, Select Committee on Narcotics, Chester G. Atkins (D-MA); John G. Rowland (R-CT); and U.S. Senator John F. Kerry (D-MA).

These hearings confirmed what the Select Committee already believed to be the case, namely, that drug abuse is a serious problem in New England. In particular, cocaine use is escalating rapidly.

Executive Summary

The assessment of the Drug Enforcement Administration is that in New England we are winning against marijuana, holding our own against heroin, and that cocaine use is escalating rapidly. Most Federal, State, and local narcotics law enforcement officials voiced satisfaction with existing cooperation mechanisms. More money must be spent for prosecutors, judges, and jails to effectively curtail narcotics traffickers. Law enforcement alone, however, is not enough, we must also limit the demand for drugs. The unfortunate reality is that American school children are consuming a lot of drugs.

State and local governments must receive more Federal resources before they can significantly curtail drug abuse. While the degree of Federal-State cooperation may be outstanding, it is on too small a scale to impact on the problem. The geography of New England with its long rugged coastline, which is ideally suited for narcotics smuggling, greatly complicates narcotics law enforcement in New England.

The asset forfeiture provisions of the Comprehensive Crime Control Act and financial investigations conducted by the Internal Revenue Service are two of the most effective weapons employed by Federal and State Governments against narcotics traffickers. However, to curtail drug abuse there must be more involvement by the U.S. Customs Service, U.S. Coast Guard and the IRS.

Central Falls, Rhode Island, is a major cocaine distribution center both within the United States and in Canada. Many crimes are committed to finance the purchase of cocaine and other drugs. In fact, cocaine is now the recreational drug of choice for many people.

More and more narcotics law enforcement officials are advoating comprehensive drug abuse education programs as the best means of achieving long-term reductions in drug abuse. While the degree of parental involvement in drug abuse education programs has increased, many parents still refuse to become involved. Some students don't view their own drug abuse as a problem, and many

school counsellors cannot recognize the signs of substance abuse in students.

Current funding levels for drug and alcohol treatment services are inadequate and need to be increased. Federal spending cuts has been driving drug abuse treatment programs out of business, with the result that in some areas of New England there are waiting lists to receive treatment.

Testimony

The following points are highlights of the witnesses' testimony to the Committee.

Massachusetts Governor Michael Dukakis:

In Massachusetts, we have developed a tough attack on both the demand and supply of drugs.

In 1983, a Statewide Task Force was formed to wage a tough coordinated attack on drugs. This has resulted in 1,300 arrests and $75 million in illicit drugs recovered.

Law enforcement alone is not enough, we must also limit the demand for drugs. The unfortunate reality is that our kids are using a lot of drugs.

The formation of the Governor's Alliance Against Drugs has made public awareness and public involvement far higher than it was a year ago.

A presumptive sentencing bill for drug offenders should be enacted.

A program of drug education should be part of the curriculum of schools in Massachusetts, with particular emphasis on the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades.

While we have not solved the problem of drug abuse, we have made progress.

Most of the resources in the fight against drugs today are State resources.

Resources are always a problem. The State has a responsibility to put some resources into this effort.

We need additional resources for drug abuse treatment. The waiting list varies in each community.

We have had very good cooperation with the DEA and FBI, because of the national and international scope of drug traffic we must all cooperate closely if we are to make progress on this issue.

We will do everything we can in Massachusetts, to combat drug abuse, but we can't do anything about the international supply. This is the responsibility of the Federal Government.

Charles Barry, Secretary of Public Safety, State of Massachusetts:

One of the most significant developments has been to put the use of talented legal counsel at the disposal of Massachusetts law enforcement officers, so that cases aren't lost on a technicality.

The Massachusetts Attorney General and the Massachusetts District Attorneys work closely together on drug cases.

Mr. Stephen E. Merrill, Attorney General, State of New Hampshire:

New Hampshire has an epidemic of drugs that is just beginning, and the drug of choice is cocaine.

The price of a kilo of cocaine had dropped $15,000 in the last 4 years from around $100,000 a kilo to $85,000.

Drug traffickers take drug money to New Hampshire to "cool it off."

There are only two DEA agents in all of New Hampshire, we could use more DEA agents in New Hampshire.

Federal, State, and local narcotics officials work cooperatively in New Hampshire.

Cocaine use is more prevalent in South New Hampshire, while marijuana usage is more common in Northern New Hampshire.

Colonel Allan Weeks, Chief, Maine State Police:

We are finding more violence against drug dealers who have agreed to talk.

Because of passage of asset forfeiture legislation, drug traffickers have started to lease equipment.

The geography of Maine is conducive to drug smuggling.

We have been fighting drug use in Maine since 1977.

The Maine ~~State~~ Police work with DEA in a joint task force on narcotics cases in Maine.

A task force on drug diversion in Maine was formed in 1978, but because of lack of resources, it had to be discontinued.

Our cooperation with DEA has been excellent.

Drug smuggling in Maine is an interstate operation.

There are only 3 DEA agents in Maine, lack of resources is a problem.

We need Federal resources to help us. Federal cooperation is outstanding, it is just on too small a scale.

A tremendous amount of drugs is coming in along the Maine coastline, in part due to the success in South Florida.

Mr. Charles Hachadorian, Jr., Drug Control Administrator, State of Rhode Island:

Fifteen of the top twenty drugs of choice are prescription drugs.

Rhode Island ranks 11th in per capita consumption of legal cocaine in America.

Rhode Island ranks 4th in per capita consumption of fentanyl.

Rhode Island follows the Federal lead in placing drugs under control, and does so almost immediately.

LSD is making a comeback in Rhode Island.

A bill which would have imposed heavy fines on drug traffickers in Rhode Island did not pass.

Rhode Island's drug abuse education program in grades K–12 needs assistance.

A Federal grant program for the States to make drug buys should be started. Twenty-five thousand to fifty thousand dollars more a year can make a tremendous difference in making drug buys.

Boston Police Commissioner Francis Roache:

The Boston Police Department receives 300–400 calls a month from citizens giving us information on drugs.

Cocaine use among people 20–30 years of age is socially acceptable, even young people are beginning to experiment with cocaine.

The heroin trade in Boston is fragmented.

Use of marijuana in Boston has stabilized.

We must take further steps to heighten public awareness of the dangers of drug abuse.

Recruits to the Boston Police Department who test positive for drugs will be dismissed.

The intelligence gathering capabilities of the Boston Police Department have been improved since I became Commissioner.

I have had complete on-going cooperation with Federal and State narcotics law enforcement agencies.

Neighborhood organizations can help curtail drug abuse as well as laws imposing stiff penalties against drug traffickers.

Thomas Leahy, Police Chief, Worcester, Massachusetts:

Worcester has been infected by heroin, marijuana use has remained constant, and there has been a 150% increase in arrests and confiscation of cocaine in Worcester in the past year.

Fifty to seventy percent of property crimes in Worcester are drug-related.

The Worcester police force is suffering from a severe manpower shortage, it has been cut by 200 people.

Federal law enforcement efforts must complement and not duplicate local efforts.

A total commitment of all law enforcement agencies toward reducing drug abuse is necessary.

Drug law violators must face sure, swift punishment.

Lieutenant Rudy Leganza, Detective, Central Falls, Rhode Island, Police Department:

Drug traffickers in Central Falls keep a low profile.

The Central Falls Police Department now has an open budget for making drug purchases.

The Central Falls Police Department averages two-three drug arrests a week.

We felt that since we could buy a lot of cocaine at a low price, we had a lot of cocaine in our area.

The Central Falls Police Department uses DEA money to make drug buys.

The vast majority of Colombians residing in Central Falls are hard-working, law-abiding citizens.

Most of the drug traffickers in Central Falls come from Medellin, Colombia.

Mr. William Weld, U.S. Attorney, District of Massachusetts:

Cocaine is currently the most serious problem we face in New England.

Against heroin we are holding our own.

Against marijuana we are making good success.

The visits of former Attorney General William French Smith to drug-producing nations was a good idea.

Illicit drug laboratories are a major problem in Eastern Massachusetts.

Prescription drug abuse is a problem.

Drug education is critical, we must convince young urban professionals that cocaine is a one-way street to a lousy life.

Of the more than two hundred defendants indicated in New England in 53 OCDETF cases, we believe all or virtually all were part of a significant trafficking organization.

Mr. Allan Nevas, U.S. Attorney, District of Connecticut:

I have a serious lack of prosecutors and agents. Three of my nineteen prosecutors work on OCDETF cases.

The Hells Angels' cocaine trafficking case tied up two of my prosecutors for a year, this gives me second thoughts about starting another major drug case.

As part of an overall narcotics law enforcement policy more drug users should be prosecuted.

IRS financial investigations in narcotics cases have been very effective.

The Department of Justice is aware that U.S. Attorneys need additional prosecutors.

I prosecuted 15 students of the exclusive Choate school as part of a cocaine distribution ring.

Cocaine use is a problem everywhere. It is widely available.

A national drug abuse education program is necessary, if we are going to reduce drug abuse in America.

Mr. Richard Cohen, U.S. Attorney, District of Maine:

While there are aways resource problems, based on my 22 years experience, I have never seen more professionalism by local law enforcement agencies.

A joint approach emphasizing both drug education and law enforcement is necessary to curb drug abuse.

Preventive detention and asset forfeiture provisions of the crime bill have been very helpful.

Drug trafficking is a serious problem in Maine.

My office has received very good help from the U.S Coast Guard.

One mitigating aspect of the drug situation in Maine is that most of the drugs in Maine are bound for other areas.

Three murders in Maine in the last year were linked to drug trafficking organizations.

Stiff sentences help deter drug smugglers.

This is the first Department of Justice to develop a national strategy of law enforcement cooperation.

Mr. Lincoln C. Almond, U.S. Attorney, District of Rhode Island:

The biggest need in narcotics cases, is for information, information makes cases.

It is going to take some time to turn the situation around in Central Falls, Rhode Island.

There have been twenty-five convictions of major drug dealers in Central Falls, Rhode Island.

Mr. Paul Brown, Assistant Special Agent-In-Charge, Boston Field Office, Drug Enforcement Administration:

The heroin situation in the Northeast is stable, and the number of heroin overdose deaths has declined.

Local heroin distribution is controlled by Blacks, Hispanics, and Lebanese nationals.

The Boston Heroin Task Force consisting of personnel of the Massachusetts State Police, the Boston Police Department, and DEA was recently formed to curtail heroin abuse within Boston.

We have seen some dramatic successes against marijuana.

The geography of New England is particularly well-suited for the smuggling of marijuana.

Three of six marijuana trafficking organizations operating in New England have been immobilized.

The availability and trafficking of cocaine in the Northeast has greatly increased.

The cocaine problem in Central Falls, Rhode Island, is serious, but not insurmountable.

In the "no dope" conspiracy case, Peter Krutschewski was convicted of conspiracy to import approximately 90,000 pounds of marijuana and approximately 6,000 pounds of hashish into the U.S., even though there was no actual drug seizures and/or exhibits by DEA.

Mr. James Greenleaf, Special Agent-In-Charge, Boston Field Office, Federal Bureau of Investigation:

The vast majority of FBI work in New England relates to Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

Forty-five FBI agents from the Boston Field Office work on Organized Crime Drug Enforcement cases.

The Boston Field Office of the FBI has 69 separate narcotics investigations pending of which 14 are OCDE cases.

Half of these cases are being worked jointly with other agencies.

Cooperation among law enforcement agencies in New England is outstanding.

In New England, FBI narcotics investigations are targeted on La Cosa Nostra, Colombian cartels, tracing of "narco-dollars" and corruption of public officials in connection with drug trafficking activities.

Mr. Bruce Milburn, Assistant Regional Commissioner, Criminal Investigation, North Atlantic Region, IRS:

We currently have 134 field special agents on rolls throughout New England who spend 25% of their direct investigative time conducting narcotics investigations.

Over the past 18 months we have increased our direct investigative time devoted to narcotics by 10%.

We conduct nearly all of our narcotics investigations with other agencies at the local, State and/or Federal level.

Mr. Donald Donuhue, Assistant Regional Commissioner (Enforcement), Northeast Region, U.S. Customs Service:

The Customs Service concentrates on drug interdiction and drug-related financial investigations.

The intelligence capabilities of the U.S. Customs Service has recently doubled and will double again this year.

In concert with the Coast Guard and other agencies, the total value of drugs seized is in excess of one hundred million dollars.

We have just established a new Tactical Interdiction Group, comprised of Special Agents and Investigators, who will be

dedicated to narcotics interdiction in the Southern Massachusetts and Rhode Island area.

The seizure statistics for the northern land border for FY 1985, to date are 1,685 narcotics seizures, and 100 unreported currency violations with $2,489,000 seized.

Commodore Robert Johanson, Commander, First Coast Guard District:

New England's 6,100 miles of rugged coastline dotted with remote harbors, its large population, and its existing criminal infrastructure for coordination and distribution combine to make this area a very appealing target for maritime narcotics traffickers.

The Coast Guard's maritime law enforcement strategy in New England has been built around random cutter and aircraft patrols, an aggressive boarding program, and development of intelligence to the fullest.

Perhaps the most heartening aspect of the maritime narcotics interdiction effort in New England has been the unprecedented level of cooperation and intelligence exchange between law enforcement agencies.

Sixty-five through seventy percent of Coast Guard patrol boats spend time in law enforcement patrol.

I am pleased with the level of support we have received from the Navy.

The key to our success is getting accurate, timely intelligence. We can always use more and better intelligence.

The Intelligence Coordination Center of the Coast Guard is getting better, but we are not there yet.

Boston Mayor, Raymond Flynn:

Although the police can't solve the drug problem alone, there has been a significant increase in drug arrests by the Boston Police Department in a short period of time.

The City of Boston is trying to enact legislation that would impose severe penalties on drug traffickers who use children as lookouts or runners.

The Boston Police Commissioner has increased the drug control unit significantly. In 1982, this unit had six people, as of November 1, 1985, 58 people will be assigned to this unit.

Drug arrests have increased 65% in the last eighteen months.

We are happy the Select Committee is here in Boston, it has given us a chance to talk to top officials about drug abuse.

State drug abuse funds for the City of Boston have increased from $8 million to $13 million. We are taking money from our operating budget to fight drug abuse.

Legislation is pending before the Massachusetts House and Senate which would impose a minimum penalty of 5 years imprisonment and a fine of up to $250,000 on drug traffickers who use kids as runners, and give protection to children who testify against drug dealers.

Boston public schools are implementing a curriculum on drug and alcohol abuse.

Sports figures, such as Robert Parish of the Boston Celtics, have helped us in our campaign against drug abuse.

65-444 O - 86 - 4

One way to reduce drug abuse is to keep the schools open into the evening as community centers.

I have seen a gradual erosion of money coming into our local government to fight drug abuse, which has created a need to shift resources and provide services with dwindling resources.

It would be easy to arrest drug runners, but this would not solve the problem. We must make the penalties so severe that people will be deterred from drug trafficking.

There is widespread political support for the legislation which would impose prison sentences and severe fines on drug traffickers who use kids as runners.

Parents groups are becoming more willing to get involved to fight drugs.

Mr. Thomas Salmon, Director, Massachusetts Division of Drug Rehabilitation:

I am heartened by recognition of the drug problem, but necessary resources to fight drug abuse must be forthcoming.

Implementation of the block grant in 1982, meant a 25% to 30% reduction for drug abuse services in Massachusetts.

In FY 1982 the Federal Government contributed 55% of the State's drug abuse budget, or $4.8 million. Meantime the State's share of drug abuse treatment budget increased from $4 million in FY 1982 to $7.2 million in FY 1986.

Services for Hispanics, women, and adolescents have been improved.

Treatment facilities are operating at full capacity and have waiting lists. Ambulatory services have a 90% utilization rate in Massachusetts which indicates a need exists for additional drug abuse treatment services.

Mrs. Geraldine Sylvester, Director, New Hampshire Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention:

Drug abuse in New Hampshire is as bad as it is anywhere in the U.S.

Law enforcement people in New Hampshire are swimming against the tide.

Millions of dollars have been spent to curtail the supply of drugs, but too little has been spent to curb demand for drugs.

We must stress drug abuse prevention in the schools.

We need to provide training to substance abuse professionals.

Cocaine has jumped from sixth to second place in popularity in New Hampshire.

We need in every school in the U.S. a comprehensive drug education program as part of the school curriculum or else we will never reduce the demand for drugs.

Mr. William Pimentel, Assistant Director, Rhode Island Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Hospitals, Division of Substance Abuse:

There is no funded drug abuse curriculum in Rhode Island schools.

There has been a 66% increase in the demand for treatment services between 1978 and 1983.

We are seeing more young people more severely involved with drugs.

We are seeing an enormous increase in use of cocaine.

Forty percent of drug abusers in treatment are polydrug abusers.

We are beginning to see some increase in heroin demand in Rhode Island.

The start of the block grant led to a 25% reduction in funds and a 10% reduction in services.

The key to drug rehabilitation is in the reimbursement for services.

Current funding levels for drug and alcohol treatment services are inadequate and need to be increased.

Mr. Jack Pransky, Substance Abuse Prevention Program Specialist, Vermont Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs:

Unless more is done in drug prevention we will always be fighting a losing battle.

The Vermont legislature passed Act 51 which mandates a drug and alcohol education program in Grades K–12 by the end of the 1985–1986 school year.

Schools must have a policy developed for students suffering in distress.

There has never been enough funds to show Statewide improvement in drug abuse, this must be changed.

Mr. Nathaniel Askia, Executive Director, F.I.R.S.T., Inc., Dorchester, Massachusetts:

As treatment professionals we must attack drug abuse at its roots in the community.

An unprecedented amount of attention has been focused by the media on drug abuse, but little community support has followed the media attention.

The "Drop-A-Dime" programs brought public attention on gang drug warfare.

We get a better return on our investment when we attack drug abuse at the local level, not by drug interdiction at the border.

If we can keep identifying local distributors, then we can disrupt the drug abuse chain.

The Federal Government has been driving drug abuse treatment programs out of business. Non-profit organizations must now pay social security taxes on their employees, which drove many of them out of business.

The second largest drug abuse treatment program in Boston, the Third Nail, has to close down when they were required to pay social security taxes.

F.I.R.S.T. is now treating many more people, but with no more money.

Massachusetts and New England have a severe shortage of drug abuse treatment services.

The existence of proprietary drug treatment agencies makes it harder for non-profit firms to get money.

The requirement of placing three months operating funds in reserve can not be met by non-profit drug treatment centers.

F.I.R.S.T. was established in 1968.

During the past 10 years, the cost of living has nearly doubled but, during the same period of time, funding for drug treatment services, has risen by not more than 30 percent.

Because of low pay, it is very hard to retain trained, qualified drug abuse counsellors.

Children involved in drug trafficking must be taken off the street.

I support increased funding for residential treatment centers.

Mr. Locksley Bryan, Chairman, F.I.R.S.T. Inc.:

New England is a major distribution center for heroin cocaine, and marijuana.

Government efforts directed toward enforcement and treatment have been misdirected. The key is to break up the drug abuse network. We can get better intelligence in the community than DEA can ever obtain.

Counsellors will stay with us for three years and then leave because of low pay. Beginning counsellors earn $13,000 a year.

The average length of stay for individuals in F.I.R.S.T.'s residential treatment programs is 18 months to 2 years, and these clients remain drug-free during this time.

Mr. William J. Hartigan, Vice President, Alcohol and Substance Abuse Division, the Mediplex Group, Inc., Newton, Massachusetts, and President, Alcohol and Drug Problems Association of North America:

Drug abuse is America's number one problem, and leadership must come from the Federal Government to deal with it.

Cocaine use is spread throughout all socio-economic levels.

Media coverage of cocaine use, escalates use of cocaine.

The age of first use of drugs for people in treatment is from 5 years to 15 years of age.

The average length of time from first use of cocaine until entry into a treatment program is eighteen months.

A continuum of care of outpatients addicted to cocaine is not available.

The impact of cocaine use on the workforce is significant, and a policy to deal with this problem must be developed by the Federal Government.

We admit a lot of 15 and 16 year olds to treatment with a 3 to 5 year history of drug use.

Many school counsellors can't recognize the signs of chemical dependency for children age 13–15.

Seventy percent of suicides, violence, and accidents suffered by people age 15 to 24 are related to substance abuse, including alcohol.

By passing the block grant program the Federal Government abrogated its responsibility in the substance abuse field. The policy-making role of Washington on substance abuse must be reestablished.

Mr. David Mactas, Executive Director, Marathon House, Providence, Rhode Island, and President, Therapeutic Communities of America:

Marathon House was founded in 1967 and Therapeutic Communities of America was founded in 1975.

Marathon House stressed self-help in treating drug abuse.

Drug abuse treatment works.

I support residential treatment programs and hospice care for people with AIDS.

With all the money we spend on drug interdiction, we only interdict 15% of the drugs, which leads to a sense of futility.

The first line of defense against drug abuse are the private non-profit centers.

H.R. 526 is a great piece of legislation for which there have been no hearings.

You should close bad drug abuse treatment programs; we invite scrutiny.

I support passage of designer drug legislation and oppose use of heroin to treat intractable pain.

The message of the Reagan Administration is that if you are indigent, and a minority group member, who cares.

Proprietary drug treatment centers will make a living and good treatment centers will survive with existing resources if H.R. 526 does not pass.

The utilization rate for treatment programs in Massachusetts is 124%.

Thomas Kosten, M.D., Assistant Professor of Psychiatry, and Associate Director, Substance Abuse Treatment Unit, Yale University:

Community sites in Connecticut to treat the State's 8,000 drug abusers are greatly needed.

The Government needs to deal with AIDS, one million Americans are carrying the AIDS virus.

There are waiting lists for drug abuse treatment in Connecticut.

It costs $70 per week to treat a drug abuser in a community treatment center in Connecticut.

Mr. Otto Moulton, Member Board of Directors, National Federation of Parents For Drug-Free Youth:

Drug paraphernalia was a $3 billion business in 1981. Forty States now outlaw "head shops" (paraphernalia sales shops).

There is no expert on the U.S. drug culture.

Ignorance is our biggest problem, and education is the answer to this.

Much misinformation about drug abuse has been generated by NIDA.

The researchers who work at NIDA work for the drug industry.

A researcher at UCLA is working on a marijuana chewing gum.

An article in the 1984 edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica on marijuana was based on 1969 data.

Ms. Georgette Watson, Founder, "Drop-A-Dime" Program, Roxbury, Massachusetts:

The "Drop-A Dime" program is an anonymous tipline on drugs whereby people can give tips on drug use in their community.

Information from the hotline is given to 14 different agencies including the Boston Police Department.

The $3,000 annual operating budget of the "Drop-A-Dime" is paid by myself.

Mrs. Joan Green and Mr. Matt Green, Newton, Massachusetts, School Department, Newton Youth Drug/Alcohol Program:

This program meets the needs for forty adolescents.

Students referred to this program by school officials must participate in it for one year, individuals referred by the courts must participate for the duration of their probation period.

Students must attend meetings in a sober condition.

By the end of our program, students can state a plan for his own future development.

Upon completing our program, students evangelize against the dangers of drug use.

Education is vital to solving the problems of drug abuse, when school is the only constant in an adolescent life, and students bring their drug abuse into the school.

Students don't see their drug abuse as a problem.

It is impossible to learn when you are not thinking clearly.

Mr. Newman Flanagan, DA, Suffolk County (Boston):

We need more prosecutors, judges, and jail space. Overcrowding should never be used as an excuse for not taking action against someone who should go to jail.

All the arrests in the world can be made, but unless prosecutions are made and done right, we are just spinning our wheels.

Seven years ago a drug bust netted $350,000. Three months ago a $20 million operation did not shock the media.

A drug battle plan utilizing all available resources and Federal and State and local cooperation is needed.

The conviction rate for drug offenses in Suffolk County is over 90%.

I have a good relationship with DEA, the U.S. Attorney's Office, and other Federal law enforcement agencies.

A mutual joining of forces, such as the Boston Heroin Task Force is essential to winning the war on drugs.

Cocaine is rapidly becoming enemy number one in the Boston area.

I support Federal funding of drug abuse education programs for both parents and students.

Police officers should receive more specialized drug training.

I am delighted that money confiscated at the Federal level can drift down to the local level.

Mr. Scott Harshbarger, DA, Middlesex County (Cambridge):

Drugs are now a problem in every community in this State. There is no crime that occurs that is not in some way triggered by drug or alcohol abuse.

White collar individuals with no prior criminal record are now distributing cocaine.

I support mandatory sentences for drug offenders.

A new element in the war against drugs is the link between high tech computer rings and narcotics.

The need to finance narcotics purchases has been a factor in the stealing of computers and computer parts.

Parents' nights to discuss drug and alcohol use by children have been incredibly poorly attended. (SCNAC has found this nationwide.)

Cocaine is the recreational drug of choice at this point.

We must undertake a major attitudinal change on alcohol and drug abuse, it will be a generational change.

Mr. Ronald A. Pina, DA, Bristol County (New Bedford):

Thirty-four organizations participate in the Southeastern Massachusetts Task Force, which in two years has seized $85 million worth of drugs.

Eighty-three percent of the felony crimes in my district are drug-related.

The influx of drugs is so large it is very hard to stop.

Because cocaine is a white powdery substance, it is very easy to conceal.

The fact that the Coast Guard can board boats for safety reasons is a great advantage.

Organized crime families in New England are now becoming involved in the cocaine trade.

To curtail drug abuse we need more involvement by the U.S. Customs Service, U.S. Coast Guard, and IRS.

While I have had excellent relationships with Customs, Coast Guard, and DEA, I have had jurisdictional disputes with the FBI.

Sometimes agency efforts duplicate one another.

Mr. Kevin Burke, DA, Essex County (Lynn):

Massachusetts DAs are in the forefront of drug enforcement policies.

The effect of drugs on the quality of life should be a significant part of your discussions.

Because fewer people use heroin than use cocaine or marijuana, there are less people involved in the distribution of it.

The relationship between property crimes and cocaine is increasing.

More cocaine is coming into the port of New Bedford, Massachusetts, because of the efforts of the South Florida Task Force.

Eighty percent of drugs shipped to the U.S. reach our streets with devastating consequences.

Large scale drug arrests have only had a temporary effect on curtailing the drug traffic.

Attempts to penetrate the higher echelons of drug distribution rings has consistently had little effect, so the task force in Lynn, Massachusetts was established to go after firstline drug dealers and buyers.

Visible, constant enforcement pressure was applied to take back our neighborhoods, and the immediate result was a dramatic decline in drug trafficking.

From November 1983 to June 1984, burglaries were down 41%, robberies were down 35%, after the Lynn Task Force was formed.

After the formation of the Lynn Task Force the demand for treatment services went up, so some of the drug dealing was eliminated.

We are aware of our limited resources, so we don't try to compete with Federal law enforcement agencies.

Street level enforcement affects the number of dealers and the openness with which they deal.

The National Institute of Justice is conducting a study of increased policy activity against narcotics in Lawrence, Mass.

The Committee should look closely at the volume of street level enforcement.

Drug education of elementary students is the ultimate answer to drug abuse.

Mr. Philip Rollins, DA, Barnstable County (Falmouth):

The key to the success of the task forces is the Federal involvement.

In the summer of 1983, we were asked not to send offenders to prison, so that beds could open up.

Wiretaps and storage of drugs are very expensive.

Accountants should be made available to the Cape and Islands Task Force on a full-time basis.

Training and sharing of undercover agents by the Federal Government is necessary.

Mr. Anthony Roberto, DA, Berkshire County (Springfield):

In Western Massachusetts, cocaine is the number one law enforcement problem.

Marijuana use is so prevalent that it is ingrained into our society.

We are losing the war against drugs in Massachusetts, because our laws are inadequate. A person receives the same penalty for possession of 49 pounds of marijuana, as he does for driving under the influence.

Education is the ultimate answer to the problem of drug abuse, with continued law enforcement emphasis.

Two and a half years ago the Massachusetts State Police Drug Task Force was decentralized to the various Massachusetts DAs offices.

It is very difficult to do narcotics enforcement in Berkshire County.

While local faces change, the "big boys" don't change in drug distribution.

Recommendations

1. Even accepting DEA's assessment that we are winning the war against marijuana, holding our own against heroin, and that cocaine user is escalating rapidly, this is still not good enough, when $120 billion annually are expended on illicit drugs with another $100 billion tacked on in associated costs including drug enforcement, prevention and treatment costs and lost productivity.

2. The Committee was pleased to learn of the high degree of cooperation and professionalism that exists among Federal narcotics law enforcement officials and their State and local counterparts. The Committee commends this spirit of dedication, but urges that supervisors and street level narcotics agents strive to maintain this through formal narcotics law enforcement conferences, and just as importantly, daily informal working contacts.

3. It is the position of the Select Committee on Narcotics that drug abuse treatment works and is cost-effective; however, drug abuse treatment programs cost money. The Committee urges that the White House Drug Abuse Policy Office, the Department of Health and Human Services, the National Institute on Drug Abuse, and other Federal agencies concerned about drug abuse treatment, examine the amount of Federal dollars allocated to drug abuse treatment programs with a view toward increasing the level of support. An expense of a few hundred dollars more per individual may prevent a person from turning to a life of drug abuse, and thus save thousands of dollars down the road. Similarly, the Governors of all fifty States should review their drug abuse budgets with knowledgeable State substance abuse officials to determine whether they are adequate to provide treatment to people in need.

4. The Committee wishes to stress the importance of self-help measures by drug abusers. While society must take steps to help them, it is also incumbent upon drug users to make the fundamental, even the life-saving decision, not to continue to use drugs. No amount of additional money will be effective in curtailing drug abuse, until individual users make their own decision to end their wasteful and life threatening use of drugs.

5. The Congress of the United States should make Federal funds available for States to establish mandatory drug abuse education curricula in all grades kindergarten through grade twelve. The Federal Government should provide funding to help insure that teachers are adequately trained in substance abuse prevention education, but should not dictate to the States and local communities course content. State Commissioners or Secretaries of Education in consultation with other professional educators and substance abuse professionals should decide the optimum number of hours per semester which should be devoted to substance abuse education, and the grade-levels to receive such instruction. Parents must lend their active support to substance abuse education efforts to ensure the success of such programs.

6. A logical vehicle for strengthening narcotics law enforcement efforts and drug abuse prevention, education, and treatment efforts is enactment of H.R. 526, the "State and Local Narcotics Control Assistance Act of 1985." H.R. 526, which is sponsored by Chairman Charles B. Rangel (D–NY), Chairman of the House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, would provide a total of $750 million annually for narcotics law enforcement and drug abuse prevention, treatment and rehabilitation activities. Specifically $125 million annually for five years would be spent in the form of grants from the Attorney General to the States, on—

> providing additional personnel, equipment, facilities, training, and supplies to State and local narcotics enforcement units for more widespread apprehension of drug criminals;
>
> providing similar support to increase the prosecution of narcotics cases in State courts;
>
> providing additional support to State courts to increase the number of narcotics cases that can be adjudicated and reduce delays that often leave drug peddlers free to ply their trade pending trial;

increasing the capacity of State correctional facilities to hold convicted drug felons and providing support to establish and improve drug treatment and rehabilitation services to drug dependent State offenders; and

providing increased support for States to eradicate illicit drug cultivation.

H.R. 526 also authorizes the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide $125 million annually for the same 5-year period to States to increase the availability of drug abuse prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs.

In hearings conducted across America over the last three years by the Select Committee, witness after witness involved in either narcotics law enforcement or drug abuse prevention, education, treatment and rehabilitation has pleaded for more resources so that they would have a realistic change of curtailing the scourge of drug abuse within their communities. A national problem such as drug abuse is comprised of a multitude of local problems, and these local problems must be eradicated one by one before the problem of drug abuse will be controlled in America.

7. Drug abuse is not confined to America's school children. It affects adults and detracts seriously from American productivity. Just as Americans have undergone a fundamental change in their attitude towards smoking and drinking and driving, the same type of grassroots support is needed to curtail substance abuse in America. Adequately funded, staffed, and publicized employee assistance programs, can make a significant contribution toward this objective, and the Select Committee encourages their development and use.

8. It is essential that publications on drug abuse contain accurate, current information. The Select Committee recognizes and commends the significant accomplishments of the National Institute on Drug Abuse in advancing knowledge on substance abuse. The Committee, however, wishes to stress the importance that publications by NIDA, other Federal agencies, State and local governments and private organizations be reviewed periodically and updated.

9. Drug abuse is an illness and can have effects as serious or more serious on the victim, as the physical illnesses to which in many cases it leads. It is essential that health care insurers review their policies on reimbursement for substance abuse treatment services, and make them comparable to coverages allowed for treatment of other physical illness.

10. The Commandant of the Coast Guard, should submit to the Congress within six months a special report on what equipment and manpower it would take to adequately equip the Coast Guard so that it can adequately and effectively carry out its drug interdiction responsibilities. This report should review the needs of the Coast Guard nationwide, as well as in New England. While being mindful of budgetary considerations, the Congress should review the Commandant's recommendations, and appropriate sufficient additional resources to adequately equip the Coast Guard to accomplish its drug interdiction mission. The appropriate Congressional committees should conduct a similar assessment of the narcotics equipment and personnel needs of the U.S. Customs Services, Inter-

nal Revenue Service, Drug Enforcement Administration, and Federal Bureau of Investigation. The Committee wishes particularly to commend the Internal Revenue Service for their outstanding work on narcotics-related financial investigations. The Committee is aware that the Internal Revenue Service has suffered a cut of approximately 100 narcotics criminal investigators, and urges the Congress to restore these personnel and augment them if possible.

11. The Committee was intrigued to learn of the link between the stealing of computers, computer parts, and narcotics. This issue merits further attention by the Drug Enforcement Administration and Federal Bureau of Investigation.

12. The Committee also urges the DEA and FBI to continue to learn more about attempts by organized crime families in New England and throughout the rest of the country to control the distribution of narcotics. Attempts to trace the proceeds of drug transactions must be maintained and intensified within the limits of available resources.

13. The cocaine distribution center at Central Falls, Rhode Island is unique and demands special attention by Federal, State, and local authorities.

14. The DEA and FBI should intensify their efforts to recruit Spanish-speaking agents for the purpose of conducting wiretaps on suspected narcotics traffickers.

15. The U.S. Department of Justice should conduct a nationwide review of the number of Federal judges, prosecutors, and criminal investigators to be sure that they are adequate to handle the heavy workload associated with narcotics cases.

16. Specialized narcotics conferences for prosecutors and police officials should be held more frequently so that these officials can keep current with the latest information available and share investigative techniques.

DRUG ABUSE AND HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS (SEPTEMBER 27)

Witnesses:

Jon Thomas, Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics Matters.

John C. Lawn, Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration.

Dr. Jerome Jaffe, Acting Director, National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Lawrence Davenport, Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education.

Julian Carroll, former Governor of Kentucky.

Victor Herbert, Superintendent in Charge of Dropout Prevention, New York City Board of Education.

Caroline R. Jones, Mingo-Jones Advertising, representing The Advertising Council.

Bobby Dandridge, former Washington Bullet.

Pearl Mack of Chicago, representing the National Education Association.

That adolescent drug use is a serious national problem is acknowledged by most Americans. What has received less attention is the fact that many of the youths most affected by this problem are

also high school dropouts. On September 27, 1985, in conjunction with the Congressional Black Caucus legislative weekend, the Select Committee held a hearing which specifically addressed the question of drugs and dropouts.

It was clear from the beginning of the Committee's investigation that a correlation exists between drug abuse and dropping out. What the nature of this relationship is, which is cause and which is effect, is less evident. In fact, there is no consensus among academicians or practitioners as to the nature of this relationship. Therefore, the Committee chose not to try to determine, definitively, the nature of the relationship between drugs and dropping out. Rather, they sought to establish the existence of the correlation and then to investigate the issues and problems that arise from that relationship. Witnesses were asked to discuss the nature of the relationship between drugs and dropping out, the national dimensions and severity of the problem, state and local initiatives being taken to respond to the problem, and recommendations for Federal action to support and facilitate state and local efforts.

The Committee's hearings not only supported the initial assumption that there exists a serious drug abuse problem among dropouts, but revealed several significant findings relevant to this relationship. These findings had also been suggested at earlier Committee hearings in Chicago, in May 1985, and in Boston, in September 1985, where public officials and community leaders were asked to discuss, generally, the problems of drug abuse and trafficking.

The findings include:

1. Our elementary and secondary schools are confronted with a serious drug problem. The in-school problem depicts only part of the picture, because absentees and dropouts are not included in most surveys.

2. The dropout problem is particularly serious among minority students.

3. Drugs and dropping out have each been associated with a variety of characteristics, behaviors, and attitudes, indicating a complex relationship between the two.

4. Although there is a definite correlation between drugs and dropping out, based on the information available it is not possible to conclude that there is a casual relationship between the two.

5. There is a reemergence of gangs, particularly in large urban communities. Their involvement in narcotics trafficking raises special concern.

6. Drug abuse by pregnant teenagers, who also usually drop out because of pregnancy, present a special concern.

7. Despite clear evidence of drug abuse among teenagers and the relationship between drugs and dropping out, some school officials and especially parents, deny there is a problem.

8. Prevention and education are the key to demand reduction.

9. Although cooperation between state and local officials and the private sector has developed in many communities, even greater cooperation is needed to respond effectively to the drug abuse and trafficking problem.

10. Federal cutbacks in funding have adversely affected state and local programming in the area of drug abuse prevention and educa-

tion as well as law enforcement. Federal support for local initiatives is critical.

The Committee's investigation also uncovered a variety of state and local program initiatives. In fact, witnesses clearly indicated that many communities do have the desire and know-how to implement drug abuse education and prevention programs. Although "denial" of the seriousness of drug abuse among adolescents exists in some communities, the primary barrier to effective programming at the state and local level is insufficient resources.

Some drug prevention and education programs, sponsored by Federal agencies, including the National Institute on Drug Abuse, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and the Department of Education, were found. Characteristically, these programs were voluntary, emphasized the role of the private sector, were media oriented, and stressed athletics. In short, the Federal agencies' roles were found to be that of facilitator and supporter. In light of the needs expressed by state and local officials, it is clear that the Federal government has abrogated its leadership responsibility and is not doing its fair share in support of the area of drug education and prevention.

From the findings of the investigation of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control several recommendations emerged. They are:

1. A grant program should be created to increase the availability of drug education programs for youths out of school as well as in school. The programs might be sponsored not only by the schools, but community organizations such as the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, or Jaycees. Some of these monies should be directed to meet the needs of high risk populations including minority youth and pregnant teenagers.

2. Present efforts by the Department of Education to provide drug education training for school officials should be expanded. Rather than voluntary, the program should be viewed as an essential component of the federal education role. School districts across the country should be made aware of the need for drug abuse training and the existence of the Departments regional training centers. Incentives should be developed to promote participation. In particular, the Department should determine which states and school districts in the country do not provide drug abuse education and promote their participation. Additional monies to support these efforts should be provided in a supplemental appropriation for the Department as well as in its fiscal 1987 budget.

3. The Department of Education, in conjunction with the National Institute on Drug Abuse, should investigate existing drug abuse education efforts at the state and local level. Successful models should be promoted.

4. Rather than simply functioning as a clearinghouse for existing materials, the Department of Education should engage in curriculum planning in the area of drug abuse education. Moreover it should see to it that information available from NIDA is developed into materials that can be read by children in all grades and at all levels of literacy.

5. An annual "Drug Education Week" should be promoted by the Department of Education and NIDA. If held in the fall, it might

"kick-off" the academic year and programs in school districts across the country that would take place through the academic year.

6. In the course of its studies on dropouts, the Department of Education should delve into the complex relationship between drugs and dropping out.

7. NIDA in its research on drug abuse should also be urged to address the relationship between drugs and dropping out.

8. Joint efforts between NIDA and the Department of Education are encouraged. NIDA in conjunction with the Department should continue to examine the issue of how best to provide different types of drug education to meet the needs of different types of students.

9. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention should consider the problem of gangs and gang violence in relation to drug abuse both in its research and programmatic endeavors.

10. The Department of Health and Human Services should focus attention on the problem of drug abuse by pregnant teenagers.

The Select Committee has published the complete findings of its investigation into the problem of drugs and dropouts in a committee report entitled "Drugs and Dropouts." The report reviews and discusses the major findings of the Committee's hearings and compares these findings to the relevant social science literature.

DRUG TRAFFICKING TRENDS IN NEW YORK CITY AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTRAVENOUS DRUG USE AND ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS) (NOVEMBER 26)

Witnesses:

Dr. David Axelrod, New York State Health Commissioner.

Benjamin Ward, police commissioner, city of New York.

Sterling Johnson, Jr., special narcotics prosecutor, city of New York.

Rudolph Giuliani, U.S. attorney, Southern District of New York.

Robert Stutman, Special Agent-in-Charge, Drug Enforcement Administration, New York Division.

Jerome Jaffe, Acting Director, National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Dr. Harold Jaffe, Chief, Epidemiology Branch, AIDS Program, Centers for Disease Control.

Dennis Whalen, Division of Substance Abuse Services, State of New York.

Dr. Beny Primm, executive director, Addition Research and Treatment Corp., New York City.

Dr. David Sencer, commissioner, New York City Health Department.

Dr. Michael Willie, director, Division of Pupil Health and Sickness, New York State Department of Education.

Leola H. Hageman, Exodus, House, New York City.

David Harris, Community Planning Board No. 9.

The Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control held a hearing in New York City on November 26, 1985, in order to review drug abuse and narcotics trafficking trends in the New

York City area and to examine the relationship between intravenous drug use and Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS).

Members present included Chairman Rangel, Ranking Minority Member Gilman, Reps. Towns, Strang, Scheuer, Green, Manton and Weiss, as well as Senator Alfonse D'Amato. It was noted that the New York-New Jersey area accounts for almost 80% of the drug abusing AIDS cases, and that 50-60% of heterosexual intravenous (IV) drug users have been exposed to the AIDS virus. Furthermore, the greatest rate of increase of AIDS is among IV drug users, who are largely heterosexual and therefore pose the greatest risk to society at large.

Additionally, a disproportionate share of minorities in New York have been affected by the AIDS crisis, as 50% of the AIDS victims in New York are Black or Hispanic, and 66% of all IV drug users with AIDS are Black or Hispanic. As a result, 66% of the children with AIDS in the New York area are children with addict parents who are 78% Black and Hispanic.

The Select Committee first heard testimony from Dr. David Axelrod, New York State Health Commissioner, who focused his remarks on the need to effect behavioral changes in intravenous drug users that could only come about if socio-economic problems were addressed. Because intravenous drug users in New York City traditionally share needles, which is a key factor in the transmission of the AIDS virus, IV addicts who continue to partake in this ritual are at greater risk. Dr. Axelrod indicated that the Health Department was evaluating the various options available in order to educate the IV drug abusing population about their risks in contracting AIDS, including the feasibility of single use needles, but added that he did not feel that the distribution of free needles would be enough to counter the above-mentioned tradition.

When asked whether the State of New York intended to screen prison inmates for the presence of AIDS antibodies, thus allowing for the availability of a control group, Dr. Axelrod expressed the belief that because nothing could be done for those who test positive for the virus HTLVIII-virus, no benefit would be derived from mandatory testing. Members of the Committee continued to express concern, however, that possibly afflicted inmates would be released, ignorant, on an unsuspecting public. Dr. Axelrod responded during questioning that he felt those who develop AIDS while in prison were all intravenous drug users on the outside whose exposure predated their entry into the prison, and that furthermore, in his opinion, homosexual activity was not a major problem in the prisons. He did remark, though, that the State was considering the feasibility of voluntary testing for the HTLVIII-virus in the prison system.

Questioning then centered on whether there was any effective coordination between the New York State Health Department and that state's Education Department in the preparation of a drug education curriculum for the school system. It was disclosed that while there has been no recent widespread distribution of a curriculum to the school districts, owing to lack of funds, the Health Department could not mandate such a curriculum as this falls under the Education Department's jurisdiction. It was further disclosed that the Health Department only reviewed the education

curriculum when requested, although the Members were assured that drug abuse prevention was a priority. Members requested that the Health Commissioner take a more active role in the preparation of drug prevention education materials.

The Committee then heard testimony from a law enforcement panel, composed of New York City Police Commissioner Benjamin Ward, Hon. Sterling Johnson, the Special Narcotics Prosecutor, Rudolph Giuliani, U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York, and Robert Stutman, Special Agent in Charge of the New York office for the Drug Enforcement Administration.

Police Commissioner Ward outlined the Police Department's efforts in deterring drugs and their trafficking through several coordinated projects, including Operations Pressure Point I and II (on the Lower East Side and Harlem, respectively), BAND (Bronx Anti-Narcotics Drive), and activities in Bryant Park, Washington Square Park and elsewhere. These efforts are augmented by the department's pilot education programs, most notably SPECDA—the School Program to Educate and Control Drug Abuse. Under the SPECDA project, the department has coordinated its efforts with the Department of Education in working with elementary school children against drug abuse. Originally confined to two school districts, the program has been expanded to seven, now encompassing 154 schools. Commissioner Ward pointed out, however, that there are more than 900 schools in which this program is not in place; private and parochial schools have not been targeted in this effort either. Commissioner Ward felt that the SPECDA program was very helpful, and that he intended to galvanize local groups in requesting proper funding for expansion of the program.

Commissioner Ward added during his remarks to the Select Committee that if the battle against drug abuse is to be won, it will be through increased educational efforts, not law enforcement. During the presentation which followed from other members of the law enforcement panel, this theme was echoed by each. Though all admitted that they could accomplish more with additional resources, emphasis from the law enforcement panel was placed on the need for a strong educational effort in our nation's schools.

U.S. Attorney Giuliani echoed the sentiments made by Commissioner Ward, but added that simply increasing the number of prosecutors would not solve the problem down the line. Should the number of prosecutors be increased, he stated, the numbers of police, agents, probation and parole officers as well as prison space would have to be increased as well. If, however, a strong prevention effort was in place, the demand side of the market would drop, thus allowing law enforcement to have a more dramatic effect on the problem.

DEA Special Agent in Charge Robert Stutman, newly arrived from service in Boston, assessed the nature of the narcotics situation in New York City by noting that while the heroin situation is approximately the same as it had been, the control of available heroin is shifting from Southwest Asian to Southeast Asian heroin. The PCP problem remains severe in Harlem, nicknamed "The Dust Bowl" for its prevalence, and Mr. Stutman noted that New York City is only one of two or three cities in the nation that still has a major PCP problem. His third assessment was that of cocaine,

which Mr. Stutman described as the most significant potential problem in New York, noting that in the past 23 days all law enforcement departments in the greater New York area had seized 2,100 pounds of cocaine.

Mr. Stutman also relayed to the Committee DEA's drug prevention efforts in Boston, explaining that youth must have a reason to say "no" to drugs, as well as turning around the "attitude of toleration" by many adults to what they consider recreational drugs. By implementing a viable K–12 drug prevention program, society can target the problem prior to its occurrence. At the present time, many drug education program begin at age fourteen, whereas the average age for first drug use is 12½. Mr. Stutman noted the irony and minimal usefulness of teaching prevention to a youngster who made the decision 1½ years ago to begin using illicit substances. Mr. Stutman added that schools must make clear to their students that drug use will not be tolerated, and that this policy must be strictly enforced.

When asked whether they favored the distribution of free needles to drug addicts, Police Commissioner Ward and Special Narcotics Prosecutor Johnson replied that they did not. Mr. Johnson added that he felt such addicts would not benefit from this educational effort owing to the tradition of sharing needles mentioned earlier by Health Commissioner Axelrod, as well as the fact that arrests have been made in shooting galleries in which needles were found, unused.

The Select Committee then took testimony from a panel of health officials comprised of Dr. Jerome Jaffe, Acting Director, National Institute on Drug Abuse, Dr. Harold Jaffe of the AIDS Task Force at the Centers for Disease Control, Mr. Dennis Whelan, New York State Division of Substance Abuse Services, Dr. Beny Primm, Director of the Addiction Research and Treatment Corporation, and Dr. David Sencer, Commissioner, New York City Health Department.

Dr. Jerome Jaffe recounted that the 14,500 cases of AIDS currently being monitored are just "the tip of the iceberg", and that the major at-risk groups included homosexuals, bisexuals, present or past intravenous drug users, hemophiliacs, transfusion recipients, and those groups' sexual partners. Blood screening for AIDS has lessened the risks for the last two groups, while homosexuals have effected behavioral changes amongst themselves. IV drug users, however, must still alter their tendencies to share needles, as 38% of New York's AIDS cases have history of IV drug use, compared with 17% for California's AIDS patients. Dr. Jaffe added that alternative treatment approaches are necessary if we are to alter the projected increase in the numbers of individuals who will contract AIDS via IV drug use.

Mr. Whelan estimated that 50% of the IV drug abusing population has been exposed to the AIDS virus, which can be contracted not only from dirty needles, but from shared syringes, cookers, rinse water, and whatever other means is used to permit the exchange of blood during the abuse of illicit substances. As there is no treatment or vaccine for the AIDS virus, Mr. Whelan recommended to the Committee that additional efforts center on education and prevention. He outlined five groups to be approached: cur-

rent intravenous drug users and their sexual partners, treatment program staff and their clients, and those at risk for becoming intravenous drug users. Mr. Whelan described to the Committee the approach being taken by "Street Studies Teams" comprised of ex-addicts who "survey" the streets and the dealers. Members of an area SST have noticed drug dealers enticing addicts with sterile needles, though in many cases, it was disclosed that the needles were not, in fact, sterile, but used needles that may have been cleaned improperly and returned to their original packaging. Thus, even those who desire to use sterile needles are being taken advantage of.

Dr. Primm noted New City has the most AIDS cases in the nation, and that in order to effect behavioral changes among members of an at-risk group, most notably IV drug users, street groups and mobile units, in face to face efforts, must be established throughout the city. Furthermore, he noted, additional enforcement efforts must be forthcoming in closing the numerous shooting galleries found in abandoned buildings throughout the city.

Dr. David Sencer, New York City Commissioner, gave the Select Committee an accurate number of those afflicted with AIDS in the city. As of the hearing, he stated, there were just over 5,000 cases, of which 36% had some relation to drug abuse. Also, he estimated that there were approximately 500,000 antibody-infected individuals in New York City alone. Dr. Sencer added that in his opinion, community solutions were needed to this growing problem, while increasing the number of treatment programs available. The latter posed a problem in the restraints required by the Food and Drug Administration, which Dr. Sencer contended made certain treatment difficult.

Again Members of the Select Committee asked this panel about coordinated efforts between the Health and Education Departments in drug abuse prevention and AIDS education materials. Mr. Whelan, of the State's Substance Abuse Services Department, noted that they offer their resources to the Department of Education in the development of materials and in the training of teachers and other personnel. The Turn Key Training Project of the last four months as sought to train trainers, and while the Education Department's curriculum has still not been distributed, the Department of Substance Abuse Services deems it a priority project.

At this point, Dr. Michael Willie, Director of the Division of Pupil Health and Sickness of the New York Education Department, was asked to join this panel. He informed the Committee that his department had worked with Commissioner Axelrod in preparing an informational packet on AIDS that had been distributed to public schools, non-public schools, universities and libraries. When asked, however, whether there was a separate program for the schools regarding drug abuse and AIDS, Dr. Willie replied in the negative. He related the history of the drug education curriculum to the Select Committee, adding that drug abuse education is a small portion of the entire health education requirement. Dr. Sencer added that the curriculum does not include AIDS related materials because certain school districts disliked the references to sex, and this has brought about controversy.

Instead, he stated, the city is working to have Health Resource Coordinators placed in junior high schools. Since pamphlets and cards won't reach those who most need this education, he contended, the Health Department has proposed the placement of "off the record", non-Education Department personnel at the junior high schoool level in order to have discussions with the students about AIDS and drug abuse in a non-threatening environment.

The last panel consisted of Leola Hagerman, Director of Exodus House in Harlem, and David Harris of Community Planning Board #9. These witnesses reiterated the need for additional efforts at all levels, as well as the related need of jobs for youth.

Members of the Select Committee concluded that a much greater degree of cooperation must exist between New York's Health and Education Departments in a drug education curriculum, that the Education Department's priority should be the distribution of an updated curriculum, and that a massive Federal prevention effort was necessary around the nation.

Agency Briefings

Bureau of International Narcotics Matters (April 18)

On April 18, 1985, Mr. Jon Thomas, Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of International Narcotics Matters, briefed Members of the Select Committee on international narcotics control efforts. Members present for the briefing were Chairman Rangel, and Congressmen Gilman, Chappie, Strang, Coughlin, Guarini, and Hunter.

Cocaine has emerged in the last year as our primary narcotics control program, Secretary Thomas said. Cocaine traffickers are moving to establish new intenational markets in Europe. He said there has been a tremendous production of narcotics, and it is becoming more international in scope. There has been significant developments in narcotics control programs, especially in Colombia. "Within the foreign policy area, I have all the support I need on narcotics," he said.

Mr. Thomas said, "I am pleased by Colombia's enthusiasm on marijuana eradication, which started on July 5, 1984. I think we can destroy 60% to 70% of Colombia's marijuana production. Last year we destroyed 5,000 acres. We are also testing herbicides on the coca bush in Colombia." Chairman Rangel said it is hard to get narcotics-producing countries to cooperate with us on eradication-control programs.

Mr. Thomas told Congressman Gilman that the Bureau of International Narcotics Matters budget of $57 million was adequate, and that counting the budget of the Agency for International Development over $100 million is devoted to reducing the supply of narcotics.

Mr. Thomas said the Rangel-Gilman-Hawkins amendment has been an outstanding vehicle to get the attention of foreign countries to the seriousness with which the United States views the issue of narcotics control. He did not think suspension of U.S. assistance at this time would be productive, Mr. Thomas said.

Congressman Guarini said, "Maybe when you reach oversaturation of narcotics, perhaps you will consider suspending assistance."

Mr. Thomas said the United States did not threaten to suspend assistance to get Colombia to cooperate with us on eradication. Chairman Rangel said the narcotics problem is too extensive to expect success everywhere simultaneously.

POSSE COMITATUS—MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO DRUG LAW ENFORCEMENT (MAY 15, JUNE 18)

The Posse Comitatus Act, 18 USC 1385, provides, "whoever, except in cases and under circumstances expressly authorized by the Constitution or Act of Congress, willfully uses any part of the Army or Air Force as a Posse Comitatus or otherwise to execute the laws shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than two years, or both." The Navy observes this policy by internal regulation. The Posse Comitatus law was originally enacted in response to use of military personnel to enforce laws in the south during the reconstruction period following the Civil War. Its purpose was to put an end to use of Federal troops to police elections in States which were formerly part of the confederacy.

The 1982 Defense Department Authorization Act provides for military cooperation with civilian law enforcement officials to the extent of providing information collected during the normal course of military operations, use of equipment and facilities, training and advice to civilian law enforcement, and military personnel to operate and maintain military equipment in the hands of civilian enforcement agencies. This amendment is generally interpreted as allowing an exception to the Posse Comitatus Act. It was enacted to facilitate increased military support for drug enforcement and interdiction efforts.

Despite the clear authority for the military to provide expanded support for anti-narcotics efforts, the problem of drug trafficking increased significantly from 1981 to 1985. To determine how the military services might play a greater role in assisting Federal drug control efforts, the Select Committee requested briefings from military officials and Federal civilian law enforcement agencies.

May 15

On Wednesday, May 15, 1985, the Select Committee was briefed in closed session by representatives of the Department of Defense and the several military services. The focus of the briefing was the feasibility of increased military participation in drug interdiction and enforcement efforts.

The briefing was attended by Select Committee Chairman Rangel, Ranking Minority Member Gilman as well as Representatives Oxley, Strang, Ortiz, DioGuardi, Hunter and Guarini. Attending from the Department of Defense were Lieutenant General R. Dean Tice, USA, Director, DOD Task Force on Drug Enforcement; Brigadier General Budge, USAF, Deputy Director of Operations, Commodore Clexton, USN, Director of Total Force and Fleet Operations Division, and Brigadier General Deegan, USMC.

Chairman Rangel opened the briefing by lauding the efforts of the Coast Guard in drug interdiction and said:

We in the Congress hear from time to time that narcotics interdiction and law enforcement are not part of the military's mission. We hear that it raises Constitutional issues and detracts from the main mission of our military forces.

There is a feeling in the House of Representatives that we can legislate a greater role in narcotics law enforcement for the military. However, I feel that, "Why should we legislate if it's not necessary?"

Thus this briefing has been called. We're here this morning to find out how we can increase the role of our military in drug interdiction and enforcement without mandating such role legislatively.

Ranking Minority Member Gilman then noted that arguments exist for and against Posse Comitatus. "But the illicit drug industry is big business bringing in over $100 billion a year. It's war. We want you to help us find a better way to combat the flow of drugs."

In his introductory remarks, Representative Gilman said there is a role for the military in drug interdiction and in intelligence gathering, if not in making actual arrests. He said we need the kind of manpower and facilities that the military has available.

Thereafter the briefing was opened for discussion and comment by the participants. The following are the salient points put forth by General Tice in his opening remarks:

His office coordinate most DOD support to the civilian law enforcement agencies empowered to interdict the illicit drug traffic. They have regular, daily access and interface with the Federal agencies involved.

In 1984 the DOD honored over 90% of the requests for DOD assistance, loaning over $88 million in equipment.

General Tice said that since the DOD Task Force on Drug Enforcement was formed in January 1984, the military has loaned over $88 million worth of equipment to civilian agencies, including 6 Blackhawk helicopters, 4 Cobra helicopters, and 11 light helicopters. General Tice said that the Army has modified normal training for crews of Blackhawk helicopters to observe activity at the Mexican border. Tice said:

The military should stay out of search, seizure, and arrest actions. Initially, we used historical precedent to make the decision we would not assist, but now we are proactive, more positive about our support. With this new outlook, we might look for additional areas in which we can be helpful. 1986 will be an important year to decide the role of the military in drug enforcement. DOD's role is one of support in drug interdiction. We are now looking at ways and means to support a drug surveillance role.

While General Tice indicated that low flying aircraft cannot be detected on military radar, this type of aircraft is not deemed a military threat. "In the absence of intelligence information, we do not target low flying aircraft as a military threat."

The following exchange thereafter ensued between Representative Gilman and General Tice:

Mr. GILMAN. What is a national security threat? When the Communists are involved and our children are using narcotics and the drug traffickers put prices on the heads of our leaders isn't this a national security threat?

General TICE. It can be a national security threat and still not be a military threat to which DOD need respond. The FBI is empowered to deal with the terrorist aspects and many other such civilian agencies have jurisdiction. We cannot degrade our war mission.

Mr. GILMAN. But the other agencies are so limited in the areas of manpower and equipment. You can give support. We want you to supplement the drug enforcement mission.

General TICE. The Joint Chiefs of Staff define our mission.

Mr. GILMAN. What would it take in equipment to effectively seal our borders or at least detect these aircraft?

General TICE. An expenditure of another $2 billion per year.

With that, Chairman Rangel thanked the participants and adjourned the briefing with a call for future meetings.

June 18

At the June 18 briefing the principal representative from the Department of Defense again was Lieutenant General R. Dean Tice, USA, Director, DoD Task Force on Drug Enforcement. Representing the Coast Guard was the Commandant, Admiral James S. Gracey. Frank Monastero, Assistant Administrator for Operations of the Drug Enforcement Administration was also present. The Immigration and Naturalization Service was represented by Ray Kisor, Associate Commissioner for Enforcement. Mr. Kisor was joined by Tom Leupp, Deputy Assistant Commissioner of the Border Patrol. The Customs Service was represented by Michael Cross, Director, Patrol Operations; Richard W. Miller, Associate Commissioner for Congressional and Public Affairs; and by John A. Hurley, Deputy Assistant Commissioner, Office of Enforcement. Select Committee Members present for the briefing were Chairman Rangel, Ranking Minority Member Gilman, and Congressmen Hughes, Smith, Coughlin, Oxley, and Hunter.

At the May 15 briefing, General Tice stated that while drug trafficking was a national security threat it was not a military threat, and that it could best be met by giving additional funding to civilian law enforcement agencies to accomplish this mission. However, at the June 18 briefing General Tice states,

In 1981 when the Posse Comitatus law was amended we took a new look at providing assistance to civilian agencies. In the last year there has been a positive change of attitude on the part of the military toward Posse Comitatus.

The briefing revealed a high degree of satisfaction among the Federal officials with the degree of support they had received from the military. For example, Frank Monastero of DEA said the only time the military had asked to be reimbursed for equipment and services is when they are not directly involved in an operation, such as with Operation BAT. He said DEA had been extremely satisfied with the level of support received from the military. Ray Kisor of INS said, "INS is very pleased with the training and support provided by the military. There is nothing that we have gone to the military for that they have not been responsive to." Michael Cross of the Customs Service said that while Customs had many problems, lack of cooperation from the military was not one of them.

Tom Leupp indicated that when the Border Patrol makes a seizure of narcotics it turns the drugs over to DEA. However, the agency's prime mission is patrol of our borders. Drug interdiction is only incidental thereto.

Congressman Larry Smith expressed concern because at the time of the hearing there were 22 vacant positions within the Customs Service in South Florida. "The Customs Service with the help of the military could detect drug smugglers," he said, "but a lack of personnel prevented Customs in many cases from apprehending drug smugglers." Mr. Hurley of the Customs Service said that the

Customs Service had received authorization to fill these positions the day before the briefings.

Mr. Hurley stressed that Customs is working closely with the Federal Aviation Administration to tighten up flight plan filings, so that Customs will receive as much advance notification of suspicious aircraft as possible. He said Customs and DEA alert State and local police authorities when they suspect a landing is imminent, and it is very rare that a suspected drug flight now lands without being apprehended. The traffickers in response are making drops of narcotics to waiting ships or boats, or to specified areas of the ocean, where the drugs can be retrieved, he said.

General Tice said that in calendar year 1984, his office had approved 9,819 out of 9,831 requests for assistance. Chairman Rangel said, he was pleased by the level of military cooperation given to civilian law enforcement agencies.

General Tice said the DoD Task Force on Drug Enforcement meets periodically with civilian agencies to discuss ways of achieving better communications and cooperation. He told Congressman Gilman that, "We are attempting to work through this logically, so that we will not waste resources. With new resources, civilian agencies will be better able to use military intelligence."

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION (JUNE 5)

On June 5, 1985, the Select Committee on Narcotics received a briefing by Mr. John C. Lawn, Acting Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration, on drug law enforcement. Mr. Lawn was accompanied by Mr. David Westrate, Deputy Assistant Administrator for Enforcement, DEA.

Mr. Lawn said that he had talked with officials of the Office of Management and Budget on the need for a total DEA workforce of over 3,000 agents. The Select Committee on Narcotics has advocated a total of 3,000–3,500 DEA agents for a number of years.

Mr. Rangel and Mr. Gilman stressed the importance of the Congress receiving accurate, current information on the narcotics situation in advance of a congressional visit to a country. Chairman Rangel said that to impress our ambassadors about the importance the Congress places on narcotics, Members have to visit our ambassadors in foreign countries. Congressman Gilman said that the Bureau of International Matters should be keeping narcotics high on the priority of the State Department.

Mr. Lawn told Committee members that DEA had submitted to the Department of Justice a proposed modification of the Mansfield amendment. The Mansfield amendment prohibits DEA agents from taking part in arrest actions in foreign countries.

Mr. Lawn said the deteriorating drug situation in Mexico was of concern to DEA even before DEA Special Agent Enrique Camarena was murdered. The fact that law enforcement personnel in Mexico were responsible in part for Camarena's abduction and murder has increased our outrage. Drug traffickers in Mexico were surprised by the intensity of the reaction to Camarena's death in the United States.

Acting DEA Administrator Lawn said unless we take the approach that drug usage is a crisis, we are going to lose ground, and

we are losing ground. He said he could not make a guess as to the amount of drugs coming into the United States. He also reported that many foreign leaders wanted to know why the U.S. Government wanted them to use aerial spraying of marijuana and coca plants, while the U.S. Government was not using this technique itself.

Congressman Scheuer said that in the last decade and a half we have spent billions of dollars on drug interdiction and have had very little effect. The entire system has failed and drug abuse is rife in our country. Mr. Lawn said he agreed with Mr. Scheuer. He said there was no tremendous commitment to drug enforcement in the 1970's, but he believed the commitment exists today. He said, however, that law enforcement by itself is not enough. Mr. Scheuer said that the system itself stimulates more production here. Seizures at the border are a cost of doing business which increases the price, and is a green light for people to grow marijuana in the United States.

DEA—DOMESTIC MARIJUANA ERADICATION (JULY 10)

On July 10, 1985, the staff of the Select Committee was briefed by Mr. Gordon Rayner head of the Drug Enforcement Administration's marijuana eradication and suppression program. This program which began with 7 States in 1981, now covers 49 States, with only New Jersey not now participating. DEA provides one week training schools, aircraft, surveillance and money to cover extraordinary expenses.

The FY 1985 funding for DEA's marijuana eradication and suppression program was $2.8 million. In FY 1984, it was $2.5 million, plus $800,000 to cover the fuel costs for the State of California to participate in the program. This year (1985) California will pay the $800,000 flying costs of its participation in the program. Other States which received large allotments from DEA in 1985 include Hawaii $260,000, Kentucky $135,000, Georgia $150,000, and Tennessee $100,000.

In 1984, Indiana was first with $400,000 cultivated marijuana plants eradicated. Four million ditchweed plants in Indiana were also eradicated. The amount of funding a State receives depends on a combination of demonstrated need for money, and how dedicated a State is in its commitment to eradicate marijuana. In 1984, for example, in Washington State the number of marijuana plants eradicated dropped greatly, but the amount of marijuana grown indoors in greenhouses increased. In 1985, DEA funded States at two-thirds of the amount of money they requested. Georgia requested $225,000, but received $150,000 from DEA.

Mr. Rayner stated that the Sierra Club and the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws had obtained an injunction which prohibited DEA from spraying paraquat on marijuana. He told the committee that DEA had prepared two environmental impact statements, one for marijuana growing on Federal lands and the other for marijuana growing on non-Federal lands. The final comment period on the environmental impact statement which applies to Federal lands ends on July 26, 1985, so that spraying could begin 30 days thereafter on August 26, 1985. Mr. Rayner

stated that DEA Administrator John Lawn had not made a final decision on which eradication method to use.

Mr. Rayner indicated that the method of eradication selected must be effective for the particular site selected for eradication. Someone with knowledge must determine if it is advisable to spray a herbicide on a particular site. The key, he said, is the rapidity with which the spray takes effect. Glyphosate acts in 72 hours to a week; 2-4-D in two to four weeks; paraquat in 24 hours; and diesel fuel in fifteen minutes. Ideally, you want to spray the marijuana midway into the growing season, so that the growers will not have time to grow another crop. After a herbicide is applied, DEA does not do the actual hauling away of the plants, rather this is left to local and State police agencies.

Mr. Rayner said that the only two States where DEA sights more marijuana than it can eradicate are in California and Hawaii. DEA estimates that 15,000 metric tons of marijuana reach the consumer each year, and that domestically produced marijuana accounts for 11% of the total consumed in the United States. He mentioned that NORML had sued in California to enjoin the campaign against marijuana planting and that the court had ruled that helicopters could not fly within 500 feet of any residence. This had effectively ended the spraying.

Mr. Rayner noted that in 1984, 3.8 million marijuana plants were eradicated, and that conservatively each marijuana plant will produce three-fourths of a pound of marijuana. He distinguished between simple possession of marijuana and growing it commercially. He said that sale of marijuana, or possession with intent to distribute it is a felony.

TREASURY-CUSTOMS-IRS AND BATF (JULY 25)

On July 25, 1985, the Select Committee received an informal briefing by officials of the U.S. Treasury Department involved with narcotics law enforcement activities. Treasury officials present for the briefing were John M. Walker, Jr., Assistant Secretary, Enforcement and Operations; Tim Stanceu, Special Assistant to Mr. Walker; John Hurley, Deputy Assistant Commissioner, Enforcement, U.S. Customs Service; Stephen E. Higgins, Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms; and Richard C. Wassenaar, Assistant Commissioner, Criminal Investigation, IRS.

Mr. Walker began the briefing saying it is vital that the Committee stay informed about Treasury Narcotics law enforcement. He said the mid to late 1970s marked an unprecedented growth in narcotics abuse and trafficking. He noted that Treasury participated in Operation Greenback, the South Florida Task Force, the National Narcotics Border Interdiction System, and the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces, all of which emphasized drug investigations and interdiction. The Posse Comitatus Act also was amended to help in the anti-narcotics effort he said.

Outlining Treasury's drug enforcement role, Mr. Walker said that through June 30, 1985, the U.S. Customs Service seized 33,000 pounds of cocaine, compared to 27,526 pounds in all of 1984. Every year 120,000 pounds of cocaine enter the country. We have a long way to go on drug interdiction, he said. Drugs are the number one

priority of the U.S. Customs Service. The results achieved by the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces are exceeding our expectations. OCDETFs have initiated 989 cases, 5,724 indictments have been returned against individuals, and 2,314 individuals have been convicted. Between 200–230 IRS agents perform OCDE financial investigations, 180 Customs personnel are assigned to OCDETFs, as well as 80 personnel from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. ATF personnel concentrate on weapons violations. ATF agents are on the front lines of the war against drugs and arms traffickers. He noted that two ATF agents were killed in confrontations with drug traffickers, and a third agent was critically injured.

Mr. Steve Higgins, Director of BATF told the Committee that as part of its efforts in the South Florida Task Force ATF participated in 267 criminal cases against 432 defendants, and 4,282 weapons were recovered. In 1984, 101 ATF personnel participated in the 13 OCDETFs. The OCDETFs brought a total of 413 cases with ATF involved in 167 of them. Of the 293 defendants in these cases 91 percent were known drug traffickers. BATF confiscated 1,750 firearms in these cases. In FY 1984, 65 percent of firearms defendants were narcotics dealers or users. Cooperation among Federal, State and local personnel and agencies has never been better, he said.

John Hurley of the Customs Service said anti-narcotics activity is the number one priority of the U.S. Customs Service. Customs relies heavily on intelligence and inter-agency liaison, such as NNBIS and the OCDETFs. DoD support, especially radar, has been helpful.

Mr. Walker said bank compliance with the Bank Secrecy Act remains a problem, and that to succeed against drug traffickers they must be denied banking channels.

Richard Wassenaar said the Criminal Investigation Division of the IRS traces profits made by narcotics traffickers and has financial reporting responsibilities. A $10,000 investment in raw materials in a narcotics source country can result in $3.6 million in sales upon the streets of New York, he said. Over 1,000 criminal narcotics investigations and prosecutions are in progress. In 1984, IRS submitted 712 narcotics cases for prosecution. In 1979, 5% of IRS resources generated 70 cases. Last year (1984), 25% of IRS resources generated 712 cases, and in 1985, IRS will bring more than 712 cases. In 1984, IRS spent over 750 staff years on its narcotics program. Approximately half of IRS' narcotics efforts are devoted to task force cases. In just the first six months of 1985, the IRS levied $180 million in jeopardy and termination assessments. Prior to the Bank of Boston case, IRS was receiving 60,000 currency transaction reports a month. After the Bank of Boston prosecution and attendant publicity, this figure jumped to 170,000 CTR's a month.

Chairman Rangel commented that he was very pleased by the impact and quality of work done by Treasury personnel in financial investigations. He said he was concerned with the effectiveness of the border interdiction program.

Congressman Gilman said, "We keep hearing about the need for more and better intelligence. What can we do to improve the quality of intelligence?" Mr. Walker responded, "Overseas personnel

help. We can put pressure on agencies that collect intelligence to see that they are looking for the right things."

Congressman Hughes said,

> It is a resource problem, we are still operating at the margin. ATF and DEA are just back to the point where they were in 1981. Traffickers are not at risk because we haven't gotten serious enough with the penalty for money laundering. We are retreating, going backward. We talk about stronger law enforcement, but we are not making the commitment.

Congressman Coughlin asked Mr. Wassenaar, "Do bank examiners help you locate high profile, suspicious accounts?" Mr. Walker responded, "Bank examiners don't look to see if accounts are suspicious. The purpose of a bank examination is to protect the solvency of the institution. We are trying to make financial institutions more accountable for knowing their customers."

NATIONAL DRUG ENFORCEMENT POLICY BOARD (OCTOBER 29)

On Tuesday, October 29, 1985, the Select Committee met with members of the Drug Policy Coordinating Group, the "working group" of the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board. Select Committee Members in attendance were Chairman Rangel, Ranking Minority Member Gilman as well as Representatives Guarini and Coughlin.

The following representatives of the Drug Policy Coordinating Group were in attendance:

D. Lowell Jensen, Deputy Attorney General.

Charles W. Blau, Associate Deputy Attorney General.

John Lawn, Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration.

Philip D. Brady, Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Patrick H. Tarr, Staff Director, National Drug Enforcement Policy Board.

The meeting, requested by Chairman Rangel in his letter of July 29, 1985, to Attorney General Meese, provided a forum for Members of the Select Committee to brief the representatives of the Drug Policy Board on the findings and conclusions of the Select Committee's Study Mission to South America in August of 1985. The meeting also gave the Policy Board members the opportunity to explain the work of the Board as well as of that of the Coordinating Group.

The National Drug Enforcement Policy Board is chaired by the Attorney General. The membership of the Board is comprised of cabinet-level officials including the Secretaries of State, Treasury, Defense, Transportation and Health and Human Services (HHS). The Board also has as members the Directors of the CIA and OMB along with Special Assistant to the President for Drug Abuse Policy, Dr. Carlton E. Turner.

The Drug Policy Coordinating Group as indicated above is the working group of the Policy Board and reports thereto. It is headed by Deputy Attorney General Jensen. The membership of the Coordinating Group is made up of representatives from the Office of the Vice President, CIA, OMB, DoD, HHS and NIDA. There are also members from the Departments of Justice (including repre-

sentatives from its Criminal Division, DEA, FBI, INS and the Marshall's Office); State-INM; Treasury (including representatives from the Secretary's office, Customs, IRS and ATF); and Transportation (including representatives from the Secretary's office, FAA and the Coast Guard).

The representatives of the Coordinating Group made the following salient points:

—In September of this year the United Nations, as it does every five years, sponsored an international conference on crime in Milan, Italy. The U.S. delegation to the conference was headed by Deputy Attorney General D. Lowell Jensen. Representatives George Crockett and John Conyers attended as Members of the House Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime as requested by Chairman Peter Rodino.

—An entire day was spent in the course of the conference addressing the narcotics problem worldwide and resulted in a resolution regarding global drug enforcement. This resolution will help direct the drug-related activities of the U.N. for the next five years. A request was made on the U.N. Secretariat to provide in the Budget for the activities contained in the resolution.

—Ninety-nine nations attested to the narcotics problems facing their countries. The Soviet Union, however, indicated that it has no narcotics problem.

—The National Drug Enforcement Policy Board is the Cabinet level group with direct authority over narcotics enforcement policy. The Coordinating group coordinates the agencies' participation in the Policy Board. The members who appeared from the Coordinating Group for this meeting only represent the "Justice" portion of the overall coordinating body.

—Mr. Jensen said, "I'm the working 'czar' for drug law enforcement." He continued, "Demand and supply side concerns come together at the Policy Board chaired by Attorney General Meese. He sits on the Board at the discretion of the President. There is a working group under Carlton Turner's direction that handles the demand side."

—The first meeting of the Drug Enforcement Policy Board was in April of this year. At the meeting, the Board decided to submit legislation to Congress aimed at "designer drugs" and money laundering.

—Legislation is introduced by the Board through the Vice President and Judiciary Committee in the Senate and through the Speaker of the House. Assistant Attorney General Brady noted that the Board should be doing more to coordinate the introduction of bills with members of the Select Committee.

—The actual policy regarding drug enforcement strategy for the country is drawn up by the Policy Board and was most recently contained in a report submitted in July 1985.

—Representatives from the Department of Education are not regular attendees at meetings held by Carlton Turner to address demand-side concerns.

Chairman Rangel concluded the meeting by asking that Patrick Tarr serve as a liaison for the Select Committee, "to make it easier to work with the Board." The Chairman continued, "We are being

flooded by heroin. We will have to have hearings on the border with Mexico and in Mexico City. We will need briefings by the Board so that we know what we are both doing—so our efforts are not fragmented." He emphasized the importance of cooperation between the Board and the Committee.

INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS (FEBRUARY 15)

The United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND) is a functional commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, and is the main U.N. policy-making body for international drug control. Since 1969, it has met biennially in regular sessions, and in special sessions in intervening years, in order to provide a continuous review of the global situation in regard to the international control of drugs of abuse.

On February 15, 1985, both Chairman Rangel and Ranking Minority Member Gilman addressed the 31st session of the CND in Vienna, Austria. In his address, Chairman Rangel pointed out that the Select Committee on Narcotics and Control is a special committee of the House of Representatives in the United States Congress, and when it was established in 1976, few thought that it would be in existence for as long as it has. Unfortunately, the growing problems of drug trafficking and drug abuse have made its continued existence vitally important. Over the years, the Select Committee has held numerous hearings with government officials around the United States and with world leaders in producing and trafficking countries around the world.

Chairman Rangel noted that while enforcement agencies in the United States continue to be besieged with drugs of all types from around the world, producing nations contend it is demand for drugs in the United States that causes increased production. We went on to point out that it is time to stop the arguments over whether supply or demand causes drug problems, and to concentrate all of our efforts on reducing both supply and demand. There is no better proof of the validity of such an approach than the fact that producer nations are now becoming consumer nations with growing abuse problems of their own. We can achieve this goal with "strong, effective law enforcement" while maintaining a "compassionate, sensitive understanding of social needs", he said.

The Chairman concluded by pledging continued U.S. support for crop substitution and eradication programs in producing nations; and by praising the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the International Narcotics Control Board for their efforts over the years to bring drug trafficking and drug abuse under control.

Ranking Minority Member Gilman stressed the fact that the only way we can counter the enormous power and wealth of the drug traffickers is by combining the resources and strength of the international community through increased support for the United Nations Fund for Drug Control (UNFDAC). Under the capable leadership of Dr. Giuseppe di Gennaro, the Fund has managed to expand projects in support of coca eradication in the Andean region of South America and poppy eradication in Pakistan. Such

activities are allowing other countries to better control drug trafficking and are making it easier for them to pursue policies of strong enforcement.

Mr. Gilman went on to point out, however, that UNFDAC had managed to achieve these successes despite the relatively low levels of contributions in recent years and declining participation by nations of the international community. Specifically, in 1982, only 42 nations are private donors contributed or pledged a modest $7.3 million to the Fund. In 1983, contributor nations dipped to 28, with contributions totaling a mere $3.7 million. In 1984, participation declined to 17 nations, and while contributions increased to $8.6 million, the bulk of that total came from the contributions of the United States and Italy. Pledges announced thus far for 1985 totaled 25 nations and a meager sum of $2.4 million.

He concluded by stressing that no nation can fight the war against drugs alone and that good intentions are no substitute for concerted, cooperative and coordinated actions. We must all take advantage of the U.N. drug agencies, he said, to "strengthen international resolve" in stamping out this scourge to our societies.

CHAIRMAN RANGEL'S TESTIMONY ON INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL BEFORE THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (MARCH 19)

On March 19, 1985, Chairman Rangel testifed before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on the subject of international narcotics control. Repeating remarks made at a press conference the day before, the Chairman sharply criticized the State Department for failing to take aggressive diplomatic steps against drug producing nations that fail to cooperate with the United States on narcotics control.

Noting the various amounts of military and economic assistance the major drug producing and trafficking nations receive from the United States, Mr. Rangel pointed out that the Administration has failed to employ the existing sanctions contained in section 2291 of the Foreign Assistance Act (The Rangel-Gilman-Hawkins Amendment) to encourage cooperation with the United States to control the international production and trafficking in illicit drugs.

Mr. Rangel went on to state that while U.S. drug control efforts abroad had been the subject of violent attacks from drug traffickers, the Administration's response has been one of "most quiet reserve." He called upon the Administration to respond to the problems of drug abuse and drug trafficking "with necessary commitment, manpower, and resources."

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT (MARCH 25)

On March 25, 1985, Chairman Rangel and Ranking Minority Member Gilman were joined by House Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Dante Fascell and William Broomfield, and the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Judiciary Committee, Peter W. Rodino, Jr., and Hamilton Fish, in writing President Reagan over the deteriorating situation in the international production and trafficking in illicit drugs.

Citing recent reports of the United Nation's International Narcotics Control Board, the State Department, the President's Commission on Organized Crime, the Judiciary Committee, and the Select Committee, the legislators wrote that, "Notwithstanding the significant efforts of the Administration, the traffic and abuse of narcotic and psychotropic drugs in the United States continued to increase in 1984." The Members asked that the President meet with a bipartisan delegation from the House to discuss a meaningful strategy to deal with drug producing nations and achieve an appreciable reduction in the supply of illicit drugs available in the U.S.

On May 14, 1984, the Members who signed the letter to the President received a reply from M. B. Oglesby, Assistant to the President. Mr. Oglesby indicated the President's schedule did not permit a meeting "at this time," but that he shared the concerns expressed in the letter. The White House response referred the Members to the Attorney General for further information about the Administration's efforts in narcotics control.

MEETING WITH ATTORNEY GENERAL EDWIN MEESE III (APRIL 2)

On April 2, 1985, Select Committee Chairman Charles B. Rangel and Ranking Minority Member Benjamin A. Gilman met with Attorney General Edwin Meese. Chairman Rangel and Congressman Gilman met with Mr. Meese both in his capacity as Attorney General and as America's drug enforcement coordinator under the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984.

Chairman Rangel pointed out that the Select Committee's findings from study missions to 11 major drug source countries, as well as recent reports by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the United Nations International Narcotics Control Board, and the State Department, all confirmed that international narcotics production and traffic had reached extremely high levels and were expanding steadily. He said there was great frustration over the increasing drug production and traffic from abroad and our inability to bring it under control.

The Chairman said statements by the Attorney General opposing aid sanctions against drug producing countries that were failing to meet their narcotics control responsibilities were in conflict with legislation passed by Congress and signed into law by the President. He said such statements sent the wrong signal to drug producing countries. He suggested that American ambassadors to these nations be called home for consultations.

Chairman Rangel said the failure of our government to curtail increasing amounts of heroin, cocaine, and marijuana from entering the country was overwhelming the ability of State and local narcotics enforcement units and criminal justice systems to effectively respond. Mr. Rangel also voiced concern over increasing amounts of domestically produced marijuana.

Mr. Gilman said illicit narcotics production, imports and use were up. He said U.S. international narcotics control efforts were not well coordinated and that the 1981 changes in the Posse Comitatus law has not been effective in significantly increasing Depart-

ment of Defense support for drug interdiction. He concluded by saying that we must do more to be effective.

Attorney General Meese responded that there is more and better cooperation on international narcotics control than ever before. He said he did not question the value of applying sanctions but stated his belief that sanctions should only be imposed against uncooperative narcotics producing nations as a last resort.

Mr. Meese said the National Narcotics Border Interdiction System, the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force Program and other Administration initiatives had greatly increased drug interdiction and enforcement efforts and improved coordination.

The Attorney General said that cooperation with State and local law enforcement officials had never been better but that drug traffic at the street level was basically a local problem. Mr. Meese said that support of State and local police departments for legislation such as H.R. 526, the "State and Local Narcotics Control Assistance Act of 1985", was just an effort to obtain any money they could for their departments.

The meeting yielded sharply contrasting analyses of the drug problems confronting the United States. The Chairman disagreed with the Attorney General's assessment on several points. The Attorney General offered to have other Department officials brief the Chairman and Mr. Gilman on Justice anti-drug programs.

25TH MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE, QUERETARO, MEXICO (MAY 9–13)

The 25th Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference was held in Queretaro, Mexico on May 9–13, 1985. The U.S. delegation, which was led by Representative Kika de la Garza and Senator Phil Gramm, consisted of Representatives Yatron, Alexander, Rangel, Leland, Coleman, Akaka, Lagomarsino, Dreier, DeLay, Goodling, and Gilman.

Chairman Rangel and Ranking Minority Member Gilman presented papers before the Conference's Political Affairs Committee on the bilateral efforts to combat drug trafficking and drug abuse and discussed the increased production of marijuana and heroin in Mexico as well as the problem of Mexico becoming a transshipment nation for cocaine trafficking. They also discussed corruption among Mexican government officials, the need for joint narcotic enforcement efforts between the Mexican Federal Judicial Police and the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), and the need to intensify narcotic eradication efforts. Congressman Gilman urged the Government of Mexico to exercise its influence to encourage other Latin American nations to contribute to the U.N. Fund for Drug Abuse Control, which, for 1984, amounted to a meager $10,491 for the entire Latin American region.

Through the efforts of Chairman de la Garza, Mexican legislators Representative Humberto Lugo Gil, cochairman of the Conference's Political Affairs Committee, Representative Mariana Pina Olaya, and Senator Manuel Ramos Gurrion, Chairman Rangel and Mr. Gilman helped formulate the Queretaro resolution on drug traffick-

ing that reaffirms the commitment of both nations to combat the illicit production and trafficking of drugs in the Americas.

The Queretaro resolution also calls for establishing a consultative mechanism between the legislators of Mexico and the United States to help improve the coordination and cooperation between the two nations in the fight against the illicit cultivation, processing the trafficking of drugs, in treating and rehabilitating drug addicts, and in warning the citizens of both nations about the dangers of drug abuse. The resolution also calls for the bilateral Interparliamentary Conference to meet more frequently, preferably quarterly to expedite follow-up action on drug-related measures adopted by both nations.

The complete text of the Queretaro resolution is printed below:

XXV MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY MEETING, MAY 10-12, QUERETARO, QRO.

POLITICAL AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE DRUG TRAFFICKING

Whereas: Mexico/United States Interparliamentary Conferences have adopted the following resolutions:

(a) The Hermosillo Declaration of 1977 on the fight against drug trafficking on the international level (XVII).

(b) The Santa Barbara Agreement of 1982 on narcotics, which commits both countries to give the highest priority to problems arising from the processing, traffic and improper use of narcotics drugs, urging both countries to draw up a comprehensive and coordinated regional strategy for this purpose.

(c) The XXIV Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Meeting held in Washington, D.C., which passed a resolution to establish a working group to assist in the efforts to combat traffic in drugs and their improper use.

Now therefore it is resolved, That:

First—The foregoing resolutions are appropriate in consolidating the efforts of both of our countries in the fight against drug trafficking.

Second—In the course of our deliberations, the legislators from both of our countries have had the opportunity to fully review the tragic events that occurred in the state of Jalisco and will report to our respective legislative bodies that we are informed that the government of Mexico has fully undertaken all of the necessary legal measures to apprehend and detain without bail the perpetrators of this henious crime. Because of the foregoing, the Mexican legislators request the United States Senate not to approve any travel advisory for the state of Jalisco. The United States delegation commits itself to carry this request to the United States Senate.

Third—We agree to the creation of a mechanism to formally establish between the two legislative bodies, a consultative body for the purpose of implementing the foregoing resolutions and for improving coordination and cooperation in the fight against the cultivation, processing and illicit trafficking of drugs, the treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts, and for warning our citizens about the dangers of the improper use of drugs and will recommend that a similar body be established by the executives of both of our countries.

Fourth—That the meetings of both Parliaments concerned with this topic be held more frequently, preferably quarterly, to expedite follow-up action on the measures adopted by each country with respect to drug eradication, trafficking and the prevention of narcotic abuse, and to discuss additional mutual efforts to combat illegal narcotics.

Fifth—The delegates of Mexico and the United States reaffirm our joint commitment in our fight against illegal narcotics production and trafficking in this hemisphere and throughout the world. Illegal narcotics constitute a threat to the well being of our societies and to our security. To effectively combat this menace requires a long-term commitment on the part of both governments to mutually supportive programs and efforts. We take this opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to those measure to evaluate, assess and verify the effectiveness of these ongoing anti-narcotics and anti-addiction programs.

Both of our nations are prepared to increase their efforts, reassess and reevaluate the resources available in order to improve upon this program subject to the approval of both governments.

65-444 O - 86 - 5

The kidnap-murder of DEA agent Enrique Camarena and Alfredo Zavalar Avelar, the Mexican pilot who flew Camarena on drug intelligence gathering missions, the mysterious disappearance of U.S. citizens traveling in Mexico, and the Vento Amendment to H.R. 2068, the State Department Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1986 and 1987, dominated the deliberations of the Queretaro Conference.

The Vento Amendment, which passed the House the day before the bilateral Interparliamentary Conference met in Mexico, warns U.S. citizens of the current dangers of traveling to the State of Jalisco. Under the Amendment, the travel advisory would remain in effect until those responsible for the murder of Camarena and other American citizens have been tried and convicted. Pursuant to the second paragraph of the Queretaro Resolution, the Mexican legislators requested the U.S. Senate not to approve any travel advisory for the State of Jalisco. The U.S. delegation committed itself to transmit this request to the Senate and accordingly, Senator Gramm wrote Senator Richard Lugar, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, urging the Committee to delete that provision from its version of the State Department Authorization Act (S. 1003).

On June 7, 1985, the Senate passed by voice vote the Gramm Amendment to the Foreign Relations Act that, among other things, finds encouragement in recent and significant changes made by the Mexican Government regarding the safety of U.S. citizens traveling in Mexico and requires the Secretary of State to transmit a report to the Congress every 90 days on the progress made in the Camarena case, the investigations of the disappearance of U.S. citizens, and the safety of U.S. tourists.

After the conference deliberations on H.R. 2068, both the House and the Senate passed section 134 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, which on August 16, 1985, became Public Law 99-93. Section 134 of the Act—

(1) deplores the brutal murder of DEA agent Camarena and the abduction of numerous American citizens;

(2) finds that the violence perpetrated by drug traffickers in Mexico constitute a danger to the safety of U.S. citizens living and traveling in the State of Jalisco, Mexico;

(3) recommends that the Secretary of State issue a travel advisory warning U.S. citizens of the dangers of traveling in the State of Jalisco and stipulates that the advisory should remain in effect until those responsible for the abdication or murder of any U.S. citizen be brought to trial and a verdict has been obtained; and

(4) authorizes the Secretary of State to transmit a quarterly written report to the Congress on the progress made in the Camarena case, the investigations of the disappearance of U.S. citizens, and the general safety of U.S. tourists in Mexico.

The next annual meeting of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary conference will be held in the United States in May of 1986.

STUDY MISSION TO COLOMBIA, ECUADOR, PERU, BOLIVIA, BRAZIL, ARGENTINA AND URUGUAY (AUGUST 3-19, 1985)

The Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control completed a two-week study mission to South America from August 3-19, 1985, to inspect drug production, trafficking problems, drug abuse and efforts by the State Department and the Drug Enforcement Administration to assist governments in the region to bring the problem under control.

This part of the world continues to be extremely important to any solution to the drug epidemic in the United States because it is the source of all of the cocaine and coca paste and 70 percent of the marijuana entering the United States.

It is estimated that at a minimum 85 tons of cocaine entered the United States in 1984 and about 125 tons entered in 1985 compared with 25 tons in 1980.*

---

*The Select Committee estimates that 150 tons of cocaine will enter the United States in 1986.

According to the Drug Enforcement Administration, 4.4 metric tons of cocaine were seized nationally in 1982; 7.3 tons in 1983; and 11.7 tons in 1984. During the first six months of 1985 in south Florida alone over 13 tons of cocaine were seized, more than in the entire country in 1984.

The Committee group visited seven countries: Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay and met with the heads of state of six of those nations in addition to meeting with the concerned cabinet ministers, parliamentary and law enforcement leaders of each government.

Members of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control who participated in the mission were: Chairman Charles B. Rangel of New York; Frank J. Guarini of New Jersey; Edolphus "Ed" Towns of New York; and Lawrence Coughlin of Pennsylvania. Norman Lent of New York participated as a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and Andy Ireland of Florida, as a member of the Committee on Intelligence.

Committee working parties participated in helicopter on-site inspections of marijuana cultivation in Colombia and coca production and eradication in Peru. They landed to inspect a site in Colombia where marijuana had been successfully eradicated by aerial herbicide spray and witnessed the aerial spraying by helicopters of a marijuana field nearby. A similar on-site inspection was made by a working party of a coca eradiction and crop substitution project at Tingo Maria, Peru.

The Committee had visited three of those countries, Colombia, Peru and Bolivia, during August 1983. On this visit they found in those countries a substantial increase in the illicit production and traffic of coca and cocaine affecting the United States and much of the world. On the positive side, they found a dramatic change in attitude from 1983 in that their governments now recognize the extent and depth of the illicit production and traffic of drugs in their countries. They realize that the narcotic boom is corrupting their institutions and society and that drug abuse has become epidemic particularly among their young people. Also on the positive side they found Colombia making a good start at effectively eradicating the huge cultivation of marijuana on the North Coast through aerial spray with herbicides.

In Ecuador, Brazil and Argentina, they learned that the enormous narcotic production and trafficking infrastructures in Colombia, Peru and Bolivia were expanding into these neighboring countries. Long dormant wild growth of coca in the Amazon jungles of Brazil is now being cultivated at the instigation of Colombian traffickers in connivance with Brazilian counterparts.

The same phenomenon has developed in Ecuador on the border with Colombia. The latter country has cooperated with Ecuador in recent campaigns to manually eradicate this cultivation. Brazil has organized and implemented three aggressive coca eradication campaigns in the Amazon basin during the past year and has also destroyed a number of coca paste conversion facilities. Peru and Colombia have commenced joint raids against illicit coca and cocaine processing on their borders at the headwaters of the Amazon near Leticia.

Brazil and Argentina are the sources for much of the industrial chemicals used to produce coca paste and cocaine in Peru and Bolivia. While it is difficult to control those widely used industrial chemicals, both Brazil and Argentina recognize the need to increase and intensify their efforts to track the movement of these substances as a means to seize illicit cocaine laboratories. Banks in Brazil are also being used by trafficking organizations in neighboring countries to launder money.

Ecuador recognizes the coca paste from Peru and some produced from the limited coca production in Ecuador is illicitly converted to cocaine in the country. Ecuador also reports that its territory is being used as a transit route for cocaine from Peru and Colombia being smuggled by air and sea to the United States and worldwide.

Argentina reported cocaine laboratories in the northeast section of the country near Bolivia converting coca paste smuggled from that country. Argentina also reports that Buenos Aires is being used as a transit base to smuggle cocaine of Bolivian, Peruvian and Argentine manufacture internationally. Brazil reports that its territory is being used as a transit base for smuggling cocaine of Peruvian, Bolivian and Colombian origin worldwide.

The Committee found that the enormous production and traffic of coca and cocaine in Peru, Bolivia and Colombia and efforts by traffickers to smuggle cocaine internationally, has led the narcotic traffickers in those countries to establish alliance and networks with criminals in Ecuador, Brazil and Argentina to further and expand their operations. This is already leading to new illicit manufacturing and trafficking activity in the latter three countries as well as a dramatic increase in coca production in Brazil and Ecuador.

Ecuador, Brazil and Argentina recognize the precarious situation in which they find themselves and the need to prepare and implement plans that will prevent their nations from being overwhelmed by the enormous and expanding production and traffic of coca and cocaine adjacent to their borders in Peru, Bolivia and Colombia.

Uruguay, particularly Montevideo, which fifteen years ago like Buenos Aires served as a transit base for the smuggling of heroin of French origin to the United States, appears to now be starting up as a transit base for the smuggling of cocaine that either originates in Peru, Bolivia or Colombia or is produced in clandestine laboratories in Brazil and Argentina from coca paste coming from the coca-producing nations. These are also a concern that clandestine cocaine laboratories might be established in Uruguay if they do not already exist. One incident of money laundering believed to be related to drug trafficking has also been reported. Uruguay recognizes the current threat the illicit production and traffic of coca and cocaine poses to its territory and people and its newly established democratic government. It is moving with the assistance of the DEA to expand and revitalize its customs and police drug enforcement programs and to obtain training.

While the problem of the production and traffic of coca and cocaine has dramatically deteriorated in the region, since the Committee's 1983 visit, it found the countries are now recognizing the

problem and have begun to cooperate with each other to bring about a solution, particularly in illicit traffic suppression.

Most impressive are the plans that have been developed and are being implemented by Ecuador, Brazil and Argentina to prevent their countries from being used as illicit drug production and trafficking centers. They are also developing and implementing drug abuse education information and prevention programs to protect their populations. Uruguay shows a similar determination and is moving to organize. The governments of Peru and Bolivia, notwithstanding their failure to date to prevent a constantly increasing illicit production of coca and cocaine in their territory, with new presidents and administrations, have now committed themselves to developing plans that will provide for limiting the production of coca to legal requirements and for the eradication of the enormous and constantly increasing illicit coca cultivation in their countries. They have also pledged to intensify efforts against the illicit manufacture and traffic of coca paste and cocaine carried out in their territory. The President of Bolivia has promised to make every effort to eradicate the 4,000 hectares (10,000 acres) of coca that is required to be eradicated by December 31, 1985, for Bolivia to remain eligible for U.S. economic support funds and military assistance. It is estimated that at least 100,000 hectares exist in the country. At the time of the Committee's visit not a single coca bush had been eradicated, notwithstanding a 1983 agreement to commence eradication. Meanwhile the planting of new cultivation continues.

In Peru, it is estimated that 100,000 to 150,000 hectares of coca are being produced compared with an estimated 55,000 in 1983. From April 1983 to the Committee's visit in August, about 4,000 hectares had been eradicated.

In Colombia, coca production is estimated at 25,000 hectares compared to 15,000 in 1983. Manual coca eradication efforts have not been effective and the Government with the assistance of the State Department is seeking a herbicide that will eradicate the coca bush through spraying. The Committee believes this must be accomplished as soon as possible if any progress is to be made in curtailing the illicit production of coca in Colombia which continues to expand.

Colombia has been effective in seizing many large cocaine laboratories and record-breaking quantities of cocaine and arresting a great number of traffickers. The laboratories, the cocaine, coca paste and chemicals used to make cocaine and coca paste are destroyed, taking as much as 25 tons of cocaine out of the traffic in 1984. However, most defendants arrested are never prosecuted and those that are, are usually not convicted and sentencing judges are threatened with death or corrupted.

Minister of Justice Lara Bonilla was assassinated in April 1984. One of the assailants was killed in the attack, the other was captured and charged with the murder. Several months later, he was released on provisional liberty. In July 1985, the Instructional Judge investigating the murder was assassinated.

The organized narcotics production and trafficking networks in Colombia have through corruption and intimidation neutralized the drug enforcement and criminal justice systems as a deterrent

to the illicit manufacture and traffic of coca and cocaine. The same can be said for Peru and Bolivia.

This Committee is more convinced than ever that the only solution to curbing the more than 100 tons of cocaine now entering the United States on an annual basis from Colombia, Peru and Bolivia, is the forthwith development of programs by those countries with the help of the United States and other concerned countries and the United Nations, to progressively eliminate all illicit coca production as rapidly as possible.

Meanwhile, simultaneous programs must be developed with Peru, Bolivia and Colombia for their National Police services to reestablish law and order throughout the growing areas to effectively eliminate coca and cocaine processing facilities and to arrest, prosecute, convict and sentence to long prison terms large numbers of important and major traffickers.

The Committee is greatly concerned that pressed by narcotic production and trafficking networks in Peru, Bolivia and Colombia, illicit production and trafficking of coca and cocaine for their domestic and world markets is beginning in Brazil and Ecuador. Trafficking trends are growing in Argentina, Uruguay and Paraguay. These trends, if allowed to develop in strength, will greatly exacerbate the problems in Peru, Bolivia and Colombia. On the other hand, curtailing the problem in the latter three countries will prevent the drug disasters about to envelop their neighbors.

Ecuador, Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay have asked for expanded training, technical assistance and equipment support provided by the Department of State's Narcotic Assistance Program and for expanded DEA personnel for increased drug enforcement operational support. The Committee believes every consideration should be given to providing this assistance as soon as possible.

In its report for 1984 the International Narcotics Control Board stated, "Illicit cultivation and production of drugs and trafficking now involves many more countries. These illegal activities continue to be financed and operated by well-organized international criminals. They are so pervasive and generate such vast volumes of capital, that countries' economies are disrupted, legal institutions menaced and the very security of some states is threatened."

The Heads of State, Foreign Ministers, Interior Ministers, Ministers of Justice, Attorney Generals, Directors of National Police and Gendarmeries in each country we visited described the threat or actual disruption and manipulation of their economies by "narco dollars" and the traffickers who generate them, the corruption and intimidation of their police and criminal justice systems, the corruption of their military forces when they have been utilized, and, in the producing countries, the loss of control over large segments of their territory to the well-equipped, well-armed large narcotic trafficking organizations who in Peru and Colombia also collaborate with insurgents to fend off government intervention.

The President of Ecuador and the Minister of Defense of Colombia with eloquence and deep emotion both emphasized that time was running out; that we are losing the drug war, that if we do not move quickly and together as friends and allies, it will be too late and entire countries are going to fall into the hands of drug traffickers or will fall prey to other antidemocratic forces that will

move in to take over in the national breakdowns created by the narco traffickers.

The Committee believes that a way must be found to help Peru, Bolivia and Colombia develop, with out assistance and support, plans and to begin implementation of those plans to bring about the progressive elimination of illicit coca while effectively suppressing the illicit manufacture and traffic of coca paste and cocaine and their processing facilities.

Similar ways should be found as soon as possible to help Ecuador, Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay prevent their territories from developing as drug production and trafficking centers through intensified technical assistance and operational support. They are in dire need of U.S. operational training, including the management and direction of narcotic units and how to operate them effectively with neighbors and other countries, and narcotic intelligence information collection and utilization. Equipment needed to effectively eradicate coca and marijuana production and to enhance illicit traffic suppression should also be provided.

UNITED NATIONS INITIATIVE TO CONTROL ILLICIT DRUG PRODUCTION AND TRAFFICKING (OCTOBER 25)

On October 25, 1985, in a meeting at the United Nations with representatives from 25 illicit narcotics producing and exporting nations, Charles B. Rangel, Chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, presented a proposal to control illicit drug production and traffic. Mr. Rangel was part of a Congressional delegation that went to the United Nations to discuss ways to fight global drug trafficking. The delegation also included Representative Benjamin A. Gilman of New York, the Ranking Minority member of the Select Committee and a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee; Representative Dan Mica of Florida, Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Operations; and Representative Lawrence J. Smith of Florida, Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Task Force on International Narcotics Control and a member of the Select Committee on Narcotics.

In his remarks, Chairman Rangel traced the history of the international narcotics control system from its inception in 1909 to the present. He also described legislative initiatives adopted by the United States Congress to curtail narcotics production. Chairman Rangel stated, "I believe no meaningful or long-term narcotic control success has ever been achieved or can be achieved without dramatically curtailing illicit narcotic crop production."

In order to curtail international narcotics production, Chairman Rangel suggested that the industrial democracies of the world form a consortium under the umbrella of the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control to develop, fund and implement the programs necessary to bring the illicit production of narcotic and psychotropic drugs under control in the existing source countries and prevent new sources from developing.

Under Chairman Rangel's proposal, the industrialized nations that are suffering from a source country's production, would work with that source country to develop plans and then contribute the

necessary financial and technical assistance to help meet the goals of those plans through socioeconomic programs, law enforcement, crop substitution, rural development and other such programs. Representatives of the drug producing nations of Latin America reacted positively to Chairman Rangel's suggestion, because they realize the United States is serious in its desire to curb rising levels of international drug production and trafficking.

Meetings With International Narcotics Control Officials

INTRODUCTION

Throughout 1985 the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control met regularly with officials of the Department of State charged with international narcotics control responsibilities, as well as American Ambassadors to narcotics producing nations when they were on tour in Washington. These meetings served to promote an effective exchange of information and views and to keep the Department, and the chiefs of the American missions in key countries, abreast of the Select Committee's activities in the international area. In addition, these sessions conveyed to both the State Department and the diplomatic corps the Committee's interest, and the concern of the House of Representatives, in specific issues and problems related to international drug production and trafficking.

Additionally in 1985, the Select Committee held numerous meetings with foreign officials and delegations to discuss drug trafficking and drug abuse. While many of these meetings were held with representatives of drug producing and trafficking nations to discuss the progress in drug control in those nations, all of the sessions between the Committee and foreign delegations promoted the Congress' desire for more effective international narcotics control.

STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIALS

Jon R. Thomas, Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of International Narcotics Matters (April 18, July 10, August 23)

On April 18, 1985, Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics Matters, Jon R. Thomas, briefed the full Committee on the State Department's narcotics control efforts worldwide. This briefing is discussed in more detail in the section of this report on "Agency Briefings."

On July 10, Mr. Thomas met with the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member to brief them on his recent mission to review narcotics control developments in Pakistan, Thailand, Burma, the United Kingdom, Italy and the Federal Republic of Germany. Following the Select Committee's return from its August study mission to South America, Mr. Thomas met with Chairman Rangel on August 23, 1985, to discuss the Committee's findings.

Daniel O'Donohue, Ambassador to Burma (February 6 and July 17)

During two home visits in 1985, the U.S. Ambassador to Burma, Daniel O'Donohue, requested meetings with Chairman Rangel and Mr. Gilman. Two (2) meetings were held with Ambassador O'Dono-

hue when he was in the United States; on February 6 and July 17. The Ambassador sought to bring the Committee up to date on the status of the Burmese poppy eradication program that began in late 1984. Ambassador O'Donohue cited the Committee's visit to Rangoon in January 1984 as instrumental in helping persuade the Burmese to inaugurate an effective drug eradication program.

William A. Brown, Ambassador-Designate to Thailand (June 12)

The then U.S. Ambassador-Designate to Thailand William A. Brown met with Chairman Rangel and Mr. Gilman on June 12, 1985, to receive the views of the Committee concerning narcotics production and trafficking in Thailand before he left on his assignment. Both Mr. Rangel and Mr. Gilman impressed on Ambassador Brown the need for the Thai to finally develop a comprehensive plan for the eradication of the remaining illicit opium production in their country. Thailand is responsible for approximately 40 tons of opium a year. The Members indicated that the Thai Government had been dragging its feet over the development of an effective plan to eradicate illicit production, and that Ambassador Brown should bring the full weight of his diplomatic efforts to bear in urging the Thai to develop such a plan.

Mr. Brown thanked Mr. Rangel and Mr. Gilman for their advice and indicated he would report back to them on his progress in drug control when he returned to Washington.

David C. Jordan, Ambassador to Peru (June 20)

On Thursday, June 20, 1985, David C. Jordan, United States Ambassador to Peru met with Select Committee Chairman Rangel and Ranking Minority Member Gilman. The Ambassador was accompanied by Lawrence G. Rossin, Country Desk Officer for Peru, Department of State.

For several years, the Government of Peru (GOP) has been proposing to initiate crop substitution programs and enforce its prohibition against the illicit cultivation of coca, beginning in the Upper Huallaga Valley. However, to date, notwithstanding United States assistance to CORAH, the country's coca control and eradication program, Peru has failed to commence the eradication program it agreed to implement in 1983.

Furthermore, the agricultural development project, PEAH, also funded in part by the United States, has not gotten beyond its initial experimental phase. PEAH is designed to provide agricultural research and extension help to increase opportunities for the transition by growers to the cultivation of other crops. Nineteen PEAH workers were murdered by narcotics traffickers in November of 1984.

The salient points made by Ambassador Jordan in the course of the discussion were as follows:

—Peru's newly elected President Alan Garcia has expressed an interest in coming to grips with the narcotics dilemma. He wants to be perceived as not afraid to tackle the difficult problems. He has other problems that he wants to address but he wants to be seen as a leader on the narcotics issues as well. He sees coca growing and cocaine as a Peruvian problem so there

is a chance for progress. He will make it a priority of his administration. He sees it as a threat to the youth, government and values of Peru. President Garcia sees himself as standing for the democratic system in Peru and does not want it eroded.

—Eradication efforts started up again in January and February of 1985. These had come to a halt after the deaths of the 19 PEAH workers in November of 1984.

—The eradication effort is hampered by the fact that the Peruvian military must approve where the eradication teams can go. Often the military will shut off an area to eradication efforts in order to sweep for terrorists.

—The two groups responsible for the coca eradication effort in Peru, CORAH and PEAH do not always work together. Furthermore, CORAH, which actually does the eradicating, is often viewed unfavorably by the populace. PEAH people do not always receive protection in the field. CORAH and PEAH have not always targeted the same areas of the Upper Huallaga Valley for their respective efforts. "We have had to force them to work closer together."

—It is in the interests of Peru to eradicate its coca crop. In the Upper Huallaga Valley, 4,000 hectares have been eradicated since 1983, without a one-for-one exchange of the growing of other crops. In 1984, 75 percent of the coca eradication target was reached in the Upper Huallaga area.

—Ambassador Jordan read a statement by President Garcia which had appeared in a recent Peruvian publication "La Republica." The statement acknowledged the seriousness of the drug problem in Peru and pledged his government to an unrelenting struggle against narcotics trafficking and domestic drug abuse, because important sectors of our youth are being deformed by drug abuse. The statement noted the vast production of coca in the Upper Huallaga Valley and said, "The freedom of action that traffickers have had up to now, seizing from the state control over unlimited areas in our jungle, leads us to believe that there has been serious neglect on the part of Peruvians of our national security. The statement also indicated that his government would work more closely with Colombia on narcotics control in Latin America."

Charles A. Gillespic, Ambassador-Designate to Colombia (July 13)

On July 13, 1985, Charles A. Gillespie, Ambassador-Designate to Colombia, met with Chairman Rangel. The meeting was in the nature of a curtesy call. It occurred just a few weeks before the Select Committee's August 1985 study mission to South America. Colombia was to be the first country visited by the Committee. Although the Ambassador was not scheduled to assume his duties in Colombia until after the Committee delegation concluded its visit there, the Chairman and the Ambassador discussed the impending trip and the seriousness of the drug problem in Colombia.

Diego C. Asencio, Ambassador to Brazil (November 8)

On Friday, November 8, 1985, U.S. Ambassador to Brazil Diego C. Asencio met with Chairman Rangel to discuss recent develop-

ments in Brazil concerning narcotics control. Brazil was one of the countries the Narcotics Committee visited on its August 1985 study mission to South America. Accompanying the Ambassador to the meeting was Mr. James Bumpers, from the Brazil desk at the State Department.

The Ambassador reported that following a recent visit to Brazil by Dr. Carlton Turner, Deputy Assistant to the President for Drug Abuse Policy, he had met with Brazilian officials to discuss Brazilian narcotics control initiatives. He suggested that the Brazilians consider convening a meeting of interested Latin American Parliamentarians to promote regional cooperation on narcotics control. The Ambassador asked Chairman Rangel to head a delegation of the Select Committee to journey to Brazil to participate in the conference if it is organized. Mr. Rangel agreed to consider doing so.

Ambassador Asencio also noted the increased interest of the Organization of American States in narcotics control efforts and urged the Select Committee to pursue ways of enouraging OAS involvement in this area. He suggested that the Committee meet with OAS Secretary General Jose Clemente Babna Soares, who is a Brazilian. Committee Chief of Staff John T. Cusack noted that the Committee had provided reports and information to assist the OAS in preparing a study as background for an upcoming Inter-American Specialized Conference on Drug Traffic. A subsequent meeting between Committee members and OAS Secretary General Soares was held on January 22, 1986.

Chairman Rangel mentioned that he had recently gone to the United Nations seeking to enlist the financial support of industrialized nations for the U.N. Fund For Drug Abuse Control. He told Ambassador Asencio that the fact that President Reagan did not mention narcotics in his speech at the U.N. severely undercut the credibility of U.S. efforts.

At the time of this meeting, elements of the M-19 guerrilla group in Colombia had just attacked the Colombian Palace of Justice in Bogota, killing half of Colombia's Supreme Court Justices and numerous other innocent victims. As former Ambassador to Colombia, Ambassador Asencio shared his thoughts on this recent outbreak of violence and prospects for narcotics control in Colombia.

Lev E. Dobriansky, Ambassador to the Bahamas, (November 12)

On November 12, 1985, Chairman Rangel and Congressman Gilman met with U.S. Ambassador to the Bahamas Lev E. Dobriansky. At this meeting, the visit of Dr. Carlton Turner, Director of the White House Drug Abuse Policy Office, to the Bahamas in June 1985, was discussed. The Ambassador also mentioned an international drug symposium which was being held in the Bahamas from November 20-22, 1985. Use of balloon aerostats to detect drug shipments in the Bahamas was discussed, and also the connection between narcotics trafficking and certain Bahamian Government officials. Ambassador Dobriansky advocated creation of a U.S.-Bahamian Anti-Drug Trafficking Commission.

Elliott Abrams, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs (October 9)

On October 9, 1985, Chairman Rangel and Ranking Minority Member Gilman met with Elliott Abrams, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. Mr. Abrams requested the meeting to talk about the Select Committee's August study mission to South America in preparation for a meeting he was planning to hold with U.S. Ambassadors to South American nations.

Mr. Rangel and Mr. Gilman discussed the Committee's study mission findings with Mr. Abrams. Following the meeting, the Chairman wrote to Mr. Abrams summarizing the key conclusions the Committee drew from its study mission. The letter emphasized the enormous and continually expanding cultivation of coca in Peru and Bolivia and the rapidly increasing coca production in Colombia. It noted the serious threat the illicit narcotics trade poses to political and economic stability in these countries and the failure of these countries to mount effective, comprehensive enforcement and eradication measures to eliminate illicit narcotics production. It urged the United States Government to negotiate seriously with Peru, Bolivia and Colombia to agree on the scope of the drug problem in each of these countries, what they must do to control the illicit production and traffic of coca, and how the United States, the United Nations and other countries can help bring the situation under control.

The letter also noted the concerns of Ecuador, Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay that they will be seriously infected by the illicit drug production and traffic in Peru, Bolivia and Colombia. It pointed out that illicit coca and cocaine production is already threatening Ecuador and Brazil. It urged the United States to expand narcotics control assistance to these four countries to support there determination to resist the narcotics threat and to encourage their cooperation with us and with each other and all countries in the region to bring under control the drug scourge endangering democracy in South America. The letter concluded by reemphasizing that the key to preventing the spread of illicit narcotics traffic throughout South America is corrective action by Peru, Bolivia and Colombia.

FOREIGN OFFICIALS AND DELEGATIONS

Major General Victor Delgado Mallarino, Director General, National Police of Colombia (March 13)

On Wednesday, March 13, 1985, Major General Victor Delgado Mallarino, Director General of the National Police of Colombia met with Select Committee Chairman Rangel and Ranking Minority Member Gilman. Gen. Delgado was accompanied by Colonel Jaime Ramirez Gomez, the Commander of the National Police Special Anti-Narcotics Unit (SANU) and Captain Oscar Martinez Quintana, Aide D'Camp to Col. Ramirez.

The visit was sponsored by the Department of State, Bureau of International Narcotics Matters (INM). Caesar Bernal, Director of the INM Narcotics Assistance Unit at the U.S. Embassy in Colombia, and George Franguille, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) representative in Bogotá, also accompanied the delegation.

About 75 percent of the cocaine consumed in the United States is processed in Colombia. An estimated 10 to 20 metric tons of Colombian cocaine production goes to the Western European market. Approximately 10 metric tons of Colombia's output is produced from domestic coca leaf. SANU has, in the past mounted periodic raids against coca processing sites. The most significant of these raids on March 10, 1984, uncovered an estimated 10 tons of cocaine base and cocaine valued at approximately $13 billion as well as a complex of processing sites along the Yari River.

General Delgado began the discussion by noting what he considered to be the three major initiatives presently underway in Colombia: the eradication of marijuana in the north coast region; the testing of herbicides begun earlier in March of this year for use against coca; and the extradition of Colombian nationals to the U.S. to stand trial for offenses committed here. Following are the salient points made by General Delgado in the course of the exchange:

—Colombia has increased its efforts to suppress the narcotics traffic. Of total seizures of cocaine made worldwide in 1984, 42% was seized by Colombian authorities, 40% was seized by U.S. authorities, and the balance was seized by a total of 22 different nations.

—Colombia in 1984 made seizures of cocaine totaling approximately 16,000 kgs, the United States about 14,700 kgs.

—The problem of illicit methaqualone (Quaalude) manufacture and trafficking has been virtually eliminated in Colombia.

—This year to date Colombian authorities have seized 435 kg of cocaine including a seizure "yesterday" of some 162 kg.

—The control of precursor chemicals, e.g. ether and acetone, used in the processing of the raw coca product into cocaine continues to be a high priority of the Colombian Government. It is a perplexing problem in that all of these chemicals used in cocaine manufacturing are produced legally around the world. Yet Colombia's control efforts have caused the price of ether to rise from 500,000 pesos to 1,400,000 pesos per barrel.

—In a recent conference held in Quito, Ecuador, President Betancur requested that narcotics trafficking be declared an "international crime." This sentiment has been reiterated by Colombia's Ambassador to the United Nations. The judicial branch of the Colombian Government now must act to put this declaration into effect.

—We are satisfied with our efforts to stem narcotics production and trafficking in Colombia; however, we have not yet reached levels (of success). We have however attained efficiency levels exceeding most other countries of the world.

—The GOC has begun coordinating its anti-narcotics activities with Peru, Ecuador, Brazil and Venezuela.

—The traffickers continue to hold an advantage over government forces in Colombia. We have to keep the pressure on them though, for each blow we strike has a positive impact on the overall narcotics situation.

—On March 12, 1985, the Colombian Congress met in extraordinary session to consider a bill which would increase the penalties for producers and traffickers of illegal drugs. Sentences

65-444 0 - 86 - 6

would be increased to a maximum of 12 years confinement. Fines would be increased to a maximum of 10 million pesos. Anyone convicted of dedicating land to narcotics production could be fined up to the value of the land.

—President Betancur will visit the United States in April of this year to discuss, on a political level, the implications and effects of drug production and trafficking in Colombia as well as to address the efforts underway to suppress it.

—Gen. Delgado defended Colombia's failure to support or otherwise contribute to the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC) by stating that the GOC presently makes a major economic sacrifice, dedicating to the fight against the producers and traffickers of narcotics a large part of its budget.

—"I do not think that we are losing the war (against drugs)," he said. "The struggle is difficult but now we have reached a critical point in Latin America. There is a total recognition of the problem and total identification of who is behind it . . . We are looking for the traffickers and they will be extradicated wherever they are found."

—The Governments of both Peru and Bolivia must decide to control and destroy the illegal cultivation of coca in their own countries for there to be noticeable reduction of cocaine availability through the world. Colombia "does have some domestic cultivation but at much lower levels" than Peru and Bolivia. The General denied reports that 20,000 hectares were devoted to domestic cultivation in Colombia.

—Were the Members of the Select Committee to return to Colombia today they would see that the narcotics situation there is "not much different. There is, however, a better grasp of the situation."

—To contain the flow from Peru and Bolivia of the raw materials used in the manufacture of cocaine, i.e. coca and coca base and paste, the GOC needs additional intelligence and intellingence gathering capabilities as well as aviation resources from the United States. The Directors General of many Latin American countries and many chiefs of police from around the world met in 1984 in Brasilia to stress the need for Peru and Bolivia to control the processing of cocaine base. The Colombians, however, have not worked with Peru or Bolivia on a political level to seek direct cooperation from these governments.

Chairman Rangel concluded the meeting by stressing the need for Colombia to work closely and politically with Peru and Bolivia to control the flow of coca and coca products across their common borders, to put an end to the traffic of precursor chemicals, and to develop a herbicide that can be used effectively and efficiently against coca cultivation. The chairman thanked General Delgado for this remarks and congratulated him on his efforts.

Rodrigo Lloreda, Ambassador of Colombia to the United States
(March 26, October 22)

March 26

On Tuesday, March 26, 1985, Select Committee Chairman Rangel and Ranking Minority Member Gilman met with Colombia's Ambassador to the United States, Rodrigo Lloreda Caicedo. Ambassador Lloreda was accompanied by Juan Diego Jaramillo, Minister Plenipotentiary of the Colombian Embassy in Washington, D.C.

The following salient points were made by Ambassador Lloreda in the course of the exchange:

—The narcotics situation in Colombia has improved since the visit of the Select Committee in August of 1983. Anti-narcotics efforts there were stepped up even before the assassination of Justice Minister Lara (Note: his murder is still being investigated although one of his assailants was killed and another captured at the scene).

—Highlights of Colombia's anti-narcotics efforts in 1984 included:

—The raid and destruction of a cocaine processing facility known as Tranquillandia in March of 1984 resulting in the seizure of approximately 12 tons of cocaine and paste. No major traffickers were apprehended in the operation. Only with Colombian police/DEA cooperation was this operation possible.

—Two-thirds of Colombia's marijuana crop was destroyed using manual and aerial spraying.

—Colombian authorities estimate that they seized about 42 per cent of the cocaine seized worldwide.

—The seizure of drugs and destruction of laboratories in Colombia must be accompanied by efforts to stem U.S. demand, or the labs will spring up somewhere else.

—The anti-marijuana program in Colombia is so effective that at present Mexico is the number one producer and the United States number two.

—Colombian and U.S. authorities are cooperating and coordinating activities at unprecedented levels, e.g. the extradition to the U.S. of Colombian nationals, the recent seizure of some 2500 pounds of cocaine from on board an Avianca airliner.

—Public opinion has become less tolerant of the drug trade because the Colombian people do not like the reputation the country has acquired of being a narcotics producer, and also the country has become a drug consumer.

—Colombia is going "all out" to fight the war on drugs and U.S. assistance in this effort will be essential.

—Judges in Colombia often face the alternative of whether "to convict (the traffickers) and die or declare their innocence and live." It is one reason why extradition to the United States was approved.

—The time has come for Colombia to contribute to UNFDAC (the U.N. Fund for Drug Abuse Control). "I will recommend this to our Minister of Foreign Affairs."

—Colombia's goal is to totally eradicate domestic marijuana cultivation by 1986. Colombia does not produce significant amounts of coca. Only a very little low-grade coca grows domestically.

—The processing in Colombia of coca cultivated in Peru and Bolivia is the big problem. There is so much jungle in Colombia, labs can go virtually undetected,

Ambassador Lloreda concluded his remarks by noting that cocaine trafficking is beginning to take hold in Brazil, Panama, Venezuela and Mexico as well as in Colombia. He noted, however, that, the heads of state of the countries in the region are meeting to discuss more efficient ways to combat the problem.

October 22

On October 22, 1985, Chairman Rangel and Congressman Gilman again met with Colombia's Ambassador to the United States Rodrigo Lloreda, to discuss American-Colombian narcotics issues. The Ambassador was accompanied by Mr. Andres Lloreda, Trade Counselor, Colombian Embassy. Common threads between this meeting and one held earlier on March 26, 1985, were that the drug situation in Colombia is improving, and Colombia, was now beginning to experience the problems of other drug-consuming nations. Ambassador Lloreda said, "Overall, the police in Colombia are doing a good job. If we review the last few years, there have been improvements in narcotics law enforcement by both the Americans and the Colombians. It helped Colombia and the United States to see each other's point of view better, now that Colombia is starting to experience some of the problems associated with being a drug-using nation, and that America is starting to be a drug-producing nation, with marijuana being grown and clandestine cocaine laboratories being found."

An issue discussed at this meeting was the implementation of a U.S.-Colombian extradition treaty which could be used to expedite prosecution of narcotraffickers. Congressman Gilman, citing the case of Jorge Ochoa, a top-level Colombian cocaine smuggler, stressed the need for better implementation of the extradition treaty between the U.S. and Colombia. Ambassador Lloreda cited the case of an individual residing in Spain, wanted by Colombian authorities on a murder charge, but who was extradited to the United States on a drug charge, and eventually was acquitted. The Ambassador's point was that the United States is not the only country dissatisfied with implementation of the extradition treaty. Chairman Rangel said. "We are having problems getting Colombians extradited to the U.S." Ambassador Lloreda responded, "We have been extraditing people at a fast pace."

Ambassador Lloreda said he did not know the status of bilateral discussions between the United States and Colombia on use of equipment to eradicate coca and marijuana plantings.

David Mellor, Parliamentary Undersecretary of State, Home Office, United Kingdom (April 10)

On Wednesday, April 10, 1985, the staff of the Select Committee, as well as staff members from the offices of Representatives Fauntroy, DioGuardi and Akaka met with Mr. David Mellor of the United Kingdom. Mr. Mellor is the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, Home Office. He was visiting the United States and met

with the Select Committee in order to discuss possible solutions to this country's growing drug abuse problem.

Mr. Mellor is a Member of Parliament for Putney. His special responsibilities in Parliament in addition to narcotics matters include criminal law and panel policy, criminal justice, magistrate courts, electoral law, probation and after-care. He is Chairman of the Interdepartmental Work Group of Ministers responsible for the coordination of Government policy on drug abuse.

The United Kingdom's Select Committee on Home Affairs of the House of Commons has a mandate regarding narcotics matters similar to that of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control. It is Chaired by Sir Edwar Lucas Gardner.

Mr. Mellor voiced his concerns over the problem of heroin traffic from Pakistan and the increasingly heavy traffic of cocaine to the United Kingdom. He stated that efforts of the Pakistanis to eradicate the opium crop are not sufficient in those areas under GOP control. Furthermore, there remains the problem of opium cultivation in the Tribal Areas and in Afghanistan. However, whether production and trafficking of heroin and morphine base is ever to be curtailed is up to the Pakistanis because it is there that ultimately the raw materials from areas outside of GOP control go for processing and distribution. So it can, in fact, be said that it is the Pakistanis who are falling short in the effort to stem the heroin problem. The problem could be managed by the GOP with the will and proper enforcement structure to do so. More has to be done especially in the Karachi-Lahore area. He said the United Kingdom backs the idea of stressing intensified efforts regarding law enforcement and crop substitution in Pakistan.

The narcotics abuse control strategy in effect in the United Kingdom is similar to that put forth in the Administration here and involves five elements: interdiction, prevention of manufacture and diversion, law enforcement, an effective criminal justice system, and demand reduction (treatment, rehabilitation, prevention and education). He stated eradication in conjunction with demand reduction is the only way to effectively address the problem of drug abuse control.

Mr. Mellor concluded his remarks by noting that the perception that the United Kingdom has legalized narcotics is incorrect. He stated, "We are opposed to dangerous drugs. We do treat some of our addict population with highly controlled dosages of heroin but no more than 120 doctors are allowed to prescribe it and this number is declining as more physicians are moving away from the drug maintenance approach to treatment."

Participants in USIA's International Visitor Program, Multi-Regional Project on Drug Abuse Control (April 12)

On Friday, April 12, 1985, the staff of the Select Committee met with the 21 participants in the International Visitor Program's Multi-Regional Project on Drug Abuse Control (hereafter 'the Project').

Multi-Regional Project is sponsored by the United States Information Agency. Project members represented 19 different countries from around the world, including a number of countries that are

major illicit drug producers. Project participants represented a diverse range of professions including education, medicine, treatment and prevention, government, corrections and law enforcement.

The discussion centered generally upon the Select Committee's role in the Federal drug effort as well as that of Congress overall. The participants spoke candidly regarding the narcotics abuse and control efforts in their respective countries and were interested in U.S. policies and programs to prevent drug abuse and curtail drug trafficking.

House of Commons Select Committee on Home Affairs, United Kingdom (April 30)

On Tuesday, April 30, 1985, the Select Committee met with Members of Great Britain's House of Commons Select Committee on Home Affairs. The Home Affairs Committee oversees and reviews efforts to stem the narcotics problem in the United Kingdom. It is both a fact-finding and coordinating body for the implementation of Britain's overall strategy to bring drug abuse under control. Its mandate is similar to that of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control.

Home Affairs Committee Members attending were: Sir Edward Gardner, Chairman; Mr. Gerald Bermingham; Mr. Robin Corbett; Ms. Janet Fookes; Sir Fergus Montgomery; Mr. John Wheeler; Mr. Jeremy Hanley; Mr. John Hunt.

This was one of the largest Parliamentary delegations ever to meet with the Select Committee. The delegation focused its inquiry and discussion upon the extent of drug misuse in this country, with particular reference to heroin and cocaine as well as to suggested means of prevention and control.

Select Committee Members in attendance were Chairman Rangel, Ranking Minority Member Gilman as well as Representatives James H. Scheuer, Michael G. Oxley, John G. Rowland, Lawrence J. Smith and Frank J. Guarini.

Following opening remarks by Select Committee Members, Sir Edward Gardner, Chairman of the Home Affairs Committee, made the following statement:

At the outset let me say that we are here to learn from you. There is frankly nothing that we can teach you.

In the U.K. the government and everyone is determined to not let up on the issue of drug abuse. There are no detectable attitudes that would favor the acceptance of drugs. In Amsterdam we are told that it is a center for the drug traffic, yet the police there allow the trade of marijuana to go on virtually unhindered because they concentrate their efforts on the hard drugs. We do not hold to this idea. We want to wage war against all drugs.

We are frightened by the prospect of experiencing a heroin and cocaine epidemic like you in the U.S. The abuse of these drugs has many tragic consequences. In response to this threat we have put forth legislation that will come up for review in August which, if enacted, would impose much harsher penalties of drug traffickers than currently are available.

We have seen the active role that your President Reagan has taken in this issue. We hope that we can get our Prime Minister involved. It is America's number one priority. We want to make it Britain's. We will return to the U.K. with ideas about changes in the law regarding our criminal burden of proof and seizure of assets.

It is a ruthless Draconian problem so our penalties must be equally Draconian. We will seek international cooperation in the UN.

I fear that cocaine abuse is the next problem that we will be forced to address in the U.K. We will hope to learn from your experiences here in the United States.

The Members of the Home Affairs Committee wholeheartedly denied that heroin had been in any way legalized in the U.K. Mr. Wheeler said:

We did in fact implement heroin maintenance programs for the treatment of addicts. It has nothing to do with legalization however. Even with heroin maintenance the scale of the problem remains much smaller than in the U.S. There are an estimated 50,000 addicts in the U.K. with a prison population of some 44,000. A total of 85 police officers have been murdered since 1900 and only one of these was said to be drug related.

But drugs are about money and the Home Affairs Committee is about protecting the U.K. from increased drug abuse. We want to bolster our intelligence gathering capability and enact legislation to enable authorities in the U.K. to seize assets and property of drug criminals. We need to get our criminal justice system going in regard to narcotics offenses.

Sir Edward Gardner added,

I am against heroin maintenance of addicts. There is no question but that drugs in the United Kingdom are illegal.

Chairman Rangel thanked Sir Edward and the entire delegation and noted that this meeting was but the first phase of what will be ongoing cooperation between Great Britain's Home Affairs Committee and the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control.

Spanish Parliament Special Investigative Committee on the Problem of Trafficking and Consumption of Drugs in Spain (May 23)

On Thursday, May 23, 1985, the Select Committee met with Members of Parliament from Spain who comprise the newly created Special Investigative Committee on the Problem of Trafficking and Consumption of Drugs in Spain. The Special Investigative Committee was formed in July 1984 as an ad hoc body to create and help implement a long term strategy to bring under control Spain's already serious and growing drug problem. The country has emerged of late as a center for the trafficking of cocaine from Latin America into Europe.

Members attending from the Special Investigative Committee were as follows: Senator Octavio Jose Granando Martinez, Committee President; Senator Angel Luna Gonzalez; Senator Carles Andreu I Abello; Senator Jose Ignacio Bajo Fanlo; Senator Jose Rahola D'Espona; Senator Enrique Romon Fajarnes; Senator Rafael Vallejo Rodriquez; and Angel Javier Martinez Higueras Staff Director.

Attending from the Select Committee were Chairman Rangel, Ranking Minority Member Gilman as well as Representatives Strang, Guarini, Towns and Ortiz.

After welcoming the Special Investigative Committee members and explaining the work of the Select Committee, Chairman Rangel made the following remarks:

Drugs have been with us in this country for a long time. In the 60's substance abuse increased due to the uncontrolled production of opium and illicit manufacture and traffic of morphine base from Turkey. At the time, 80–90 percent of our heroin was produced in Marseille, France, from raw materials originating in Turkey. Since then we have entered into agreements with the Turkish authorities resulting in their banning the production of gum opium poppy and limiting poppy production for straw only.

Subsequently, we have experienced a boom in the traffic of heroin from Mexico, the Golden Triangle and the Middle East. The United Nations and the State Department have both said that we can expect bumper crops in these regions this year.

Yet we here in this country believe that it is possible to get a handle on the problem. Toward this end the Select Committee was formed in 1976. But ultimately the effort must be an international one. Other countries must be prepared to give assistance, financial and technical, to the drug producers because for many nations drugs are a cash crop.

We are troubled, however, by the fact that while we provide a great deal of assistance to those countries from which drugs come, we do not receive their cooperation in bringing drugs and drug production under control. Our diplomats do not believe that suspending aid is the wise course and the military is reluctant to get involved with what have traditionally been civilian law enforcement matters.

All of us on the Select Committee believe that not enough money is spent on prevention and education. All the while though, the television and commercial markets show that there is nothing wrong with drugs . . . that they can solve problems. The First Lady is doing her best to counter this perception.

In the months to come the Select Committee will call on some of our celebrities and sports stars to counter the image that nothing is wrong with drugs. But we need more cooperation overseas. We need more UN participation and more resources to ensure the effectiveness of our law enforcement agencies. We need to know also that treatment and prevention issues are higher on our list of concerns.

The issue of drugs and drug abuse in this country is and must be a bipartisan effort. We speak, Democrats and Republicans alike, with one voice.

Ranking Minority Member Gilman noted the following:

We are in the United States confronted with a narcotics business that last year grossed over $100 billion, with a resultant $100 billion cost in drug related crime, loss productivity and the social cost of enforcement, prisons, treatment, rehabilitation and education programs. It kills and affects young people here and around the world.

There are unfortunately no magic answers to counter the inceasing amounts of narcotics reaching our shores, yet we're always trying. Chairman Rangel and I were in Vienna not long ago to encourage more cooperation among member UN countries. Contributions to the UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control are meager in light of the enormity of the problem.

So I hope that we can find better ways to fight drugs and those who traffic them so viciously throughout the world.

Thereafter, the following salient points were made by the Spanish Senators in the course of the meeting:

—They agreed that Spain should increase its contribution to the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC). They said this is not the ultimate solution to the problem, however, because of the enormous sums of money that can be made. The money is too corruptive. The problem is compounded they said by the involvement of guerrilla movements and the ready availability of chemicals used in the processing of illicit drugs.

—Since Spain modified its criminal code in 1983 the perception around the world has been that the country is "easy" on drugs. The 1983 legislation however, only reduced sentences regarding marijuana use and possession. They claimed, though, that marijuana use and seizures have not increased (Note: there is evidence to the contrary). Heroin and cocaine abuse and trafficking is on the rise. Legislation is being considered to stiffen narcotics/related penalties. "The Spanish legislature is not easy on drugs," according to Senator Granando.

—The problem of laundering money through Spanish Financial Institutions is increasing. The Spanish Parliament is considering legislation to deal with the problem.

—Legislation to increase requirements on foreign visitors to have visas to enter Spain is presently before the Parliament (Note: Spain maintains dual nationality arrangements with many of

the narcotics producing and trafficking countries of Latin America and does not require visas for Iranians).

—The drug problem in Spain involves marijuana from Morocco, heroin from Iran, Pakistan and Nigeria as well as cocaine from Latin America. At present the major problem is the trafficking and abuse of cocaine.

Mariano Baptista, Ambassador of Bolivia to the United States (June 11)

On Tuesday, June 11, 1985, Select Committee Chairman Rangel met with Bolivia's Ambassador to the United States, Mariano Baptista. Accompanying the Ambassador was Mr. Jorge Pol, First Secretary of the Bolivian Embassy. Ambassador Baptista requested the meeting in order to voice his concerns over the possible imposition by Congress of aid sanctions against Bolivia.

Coca leaf produced in Bolivia is the raw material responsible for 45 percent of the cocaine entering the United States. About 10 percent of the cocaine is also illicitly produced in Bolivia. Estimates on the quantity of coca being grown annually in Bolivia range from 200,000 to 240,000 metric tons. Reports also indicate that coca production in Bolivia continues to increase on an annual basis over four traditional and three non-traditional areas of the country.

Ambassador Baptista began the discussion by noting his concern regarding the possible imposition of sanctions against Bolivia. Any sanctions would have a dangerous effect on the democratic process in Bolivia he said. Furthermore, the Ambassador noted, sanctions would be counterproductive to U.S. interests by weakening a relatively stable government in a strategically important part of the world. Ambassador Baptista said Bolivia had made good efforts against narcotics but that Bolivia lack the necessary means to fight the drug traffickers. He said Bolivia needed more aid, not less. He said it would be unjust to single out Bolivia for sanctions.

Chairman Rangel said he was sympathetic and proud of Bolivia for the stability it has achieved. He also said Congress wanted to help Bolivia with narcotic crop eradication and crop substitution. He pointed out however, that no eradication of coca had begun in Bolivia notwithstanding Bolivia's agreements with the United States to eradicate 4,000 hectares by the end of 1985.

Mr. Rangel said Members of Congress must answer to their constituents. He said it is difficult for Members to explain why Bolivia should continue to receive aid when Bolivia does not even have a plan in effect to eradicate illicit coca cultivation. Mr. Rangel said Congress does not want to impose sanctions on our friends, but Bolivia must at least have narcotics control on its agenda. Bolivia must give the impression that at a minimum it is fighting a battle even if only a losing one at present. Mr. Rangel said it was essential for Bolivia to begin eradicating its illicit coca crop.

Dr. Jose Paulo Cavalcanti, Secretary General, Ministry of Justice, Brazil (July 9)

On Tuesday, July 9, 1985, Select Committee Chairman Rangel, Ranking Minority Member Gilman, and Representative Guarini met with Brazil's newly appointed Secretary General, Ministry of

Justice, Dr. Jose Paulo Cavalcanti Filho. Dr. Cavalcanti was escorted by Dr. Paulo Rolo, Legal Advisor, American Embassy in Brasilia and by Mr. Tupy Maura, Counselor, Brazilian Embassy in Washington. Greg Kenaston, Staff Assistant, Congressional Affairs and Donald Young, Staff Coordinator, Office of International Programs accompanied Dr. Cavalcanti from DEA.

Dr. Cavalcanti was named to the above position in March of 1985. Reports have indicated that Brazil has recently become a conduit for European-bound drugs, especially cocaine from the Andean producer nations. Brazil has also become a producer of coca, although the extent of this production is not known. Brazil, however, has of late shown an eagerness to begin extraditing traffickers by responding in August of 1984 to an Italian request for the return of Tommaso Buscetta, a leading member of the Italian Mafia who since his return to Italy and subsequent transfer to this country, has provided much detailed information on the workings of the Mafia.

Dr. Cavalcanti said the narcotics problem in Brazil is a social problem and a national priority. He said Brazil will fight narcotics with or without the help of the United States. Yet the Brazilians ha e followed the approach taken by the United States. The focus is upon not only law enforcement, but also education, treatment, prevention and diplomatic efforts overseas.

He stated that, "fortunately in Brazil, coca consumption and production was not the problem that it was elsewhere in the world so Brazil was in a position to better bring it under control." He said Brazil was acting at the right time now to catch coca production before it grows to unmanageable proportions.

Continuing, Dr. Cavalcanti said Brazil wants to be a good country, a good neighbor to the nations of the world. He said Brazil does not want to be labeled as a major producer of coca or cocaine.

The meeting ended after assurances from the Chairman and the other members in attendance that Brazil was in no way being condemned as a major coca and cocaine producer.

Luis Marchand, Ambassador of Peru to the United States (July 10, November 20)

July 10

On July 10, 1985, the eve of House consideration of H.R. 1555, the Foreign Assistance Authorization for Fiscal Years 1986 and 1987, Chairman Rangel and Ranking Minority Member Gilman met briefly with the Peruvian Ambassador to the United States Luis Marchand. The meeting was held in Chairman Rangel's office and was requested by Ambassador Marchand so that he could express his grave reservations about the proposed Rangel amendment to the authorization bill. The amendment permitted U.S. aid to Peru in fiscal year 1986 only if the President reported to Congress that Peru had demonstrated substantial progress in developing a plan to establish its legal coca requirements, license the number of hectares needed to produce the legal requirement and eliminate illicit cultivation. For 1987, U.S. aid would be permitted to Peru only if the President reported to Congress that Peru had developed such a plan and was implementing it. The amendment further prohibit-

ed development assistance funds to Peru in 1987 for AID's Upper Huallaga Valley project unless the President had submitted the report required for 1987 described above. The amendment inlcuded similar aid sanctions against Bolivia. (The amendment was subsequently passed by the House on July 11, 1985, accepted by the Senate, and signed into law by the President, P.L. 99-83, section 612).

Ambassador Marchand stressed two points in opposition to the amendment. First, he said the amendment would place the new, democratically elected, and soon to be inaugurated President of Peru, Alan Garcia, in a very diffcult position when he assumed power. Second, he said the amendment could well prove to be counterproductive. By prohibiting much needed aid, it had the potential of making a bad situation even worse, forcing poor farmers to rely more on coca production as a way of sustaining themselves and their families.

Both Chairman Rangel and Mr. Gilman stressed the fact that cocaine trafficking and abuse had reached epidemic proportions in the United States. Despite all the U.S. economic and military assistance that had been provided to Peru and Bolivia, and all the assurances that something would be done about illicit coca cultivation, coca and cocaine production continued to increase. It was extremely difficult, they said, to explain to the American people why Congress continued to provide assistance to countries which produced the raw materials that were destroying American youth and the very fabric of American society. They said there comes a time when firm action is required, and the amendment under consideration was a fair way to deal with a desperate situation. Continuing, they told the Ambassador that Congress could no longer wait for drug source nations to turn the corner in their efforts against narcotic production, but that incentives must be provided for them to achieve that goal.

The meeting concluded on a positive note of resolve to continue cooperative efforts in this area.

November 20

On November 20, 1985, Select Committee Chairman Charles B. Rangel and Ranking Minority Member Benjamin A. Gilman met again with Peruvian Ambassador to the United States Luis Marchand to discuss ongoing anti-narcotics efforts in Peru.

Chairman Rangel made reference to the Select Committee's recent trip to South America, and how impressed he was with newly elected President Alan Garcia, especially in terms of the cooperative anti-narcotics operations that he has initiated with the Government of Colombia. The Chairman went on to point out that the real problems in Peru concerned the fact that serious eradication efforts had not taken place, and it appeared that law enforcement personnel failed to see that anything was wrong. In addition he pointed to the basic problem that no one seems to want to grow substitute crops when they can make more money growing coca and selling cocaine.

In specific reference to the lack of effort in terms of eradication, Mr. Gilman pointed to the fact that only one-half of the $15 million for the Tingo Maria eradication project had been expended since

1981. He went on to point out that while terrorism in region was certainly an obstacle to overcome, there was a very definite need for improved coordination among enforcement authorities. Mr. Gilman went on to point out that while the State Department had denied reports that the debt problems of Peru were an impediment to narcotics assistance, it was essential that an eradication plan be presented in the near future if U.S. aid was to continue.

Ambassador Marchand responded to these points by saying that President Garcia was a sincere and honest man who had made a firm dedication to fight narcotics trafficking and achieve eradication goals. He also pointed to the very real problems created by his country's $2.5 billion in debt payments, and the fact that this situation had been compounded by the recent cuts in credits to Peru by the U.S. Government. In addition, he said U.S. military support had been cut by 50% because of the narcotics problem.

Chairman Rangel and Mr. Gilman raised the issue of the need for South American countries to provide at least symbolic support for the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC) and to seek increased support for UNFDAC from their closest friends.

The meeting concluded with Ambassador Marchand pointing to the fact that progress in Peru had been slow because of prior years of military rule. He said the present elected government had been a great victory for Peru and puts Peru in a much better position to act.

Argentine Parliamentarians (September 9)

On September 9, 1985, Ranking Minority Member Benjamin A. Gilman, accompanied by Rep. Larry Smith, chaired a meeting with the Argentine Congressional Delegation. The Argentine Delegation consisted of Deputy Balbino Zubiri, Chairman of the Committee Armed Forces; Deputy Carlos Becerra, Secretary of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and Deputy Jose Brodon, a Member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Gilman made a number of important points in opening the meeting. He indicated that the recently concluded Select Committee study mission to South America was aimed primarily at fostering cooperative efforts among these nations in reducing illicit drug production, and that Argentina was in an excellent position to take the lead in such cooperative eradication and enforcement efforts. He went on to point out that the ruthlessness of the drug traffickers and their corruptive influence on government anti-narcotics efforts were especially evident in Bolivia and Peru. While the Committee had received strong commitments from the leaders of these two nations on its recent visit, it is vitally important to note that as enforcement efforts tighten in some South American nations, the problems spread to others, especially neighboring nations.

Deputy Zubiri indicated that the major problem in Argentina was on the border with Bolivia. It is a long border and difficult to protect, and while he was encouraged over the promise of efforts by the new Government of Bolivia, no real action had been taken to date.

It was also mentioned that the new Presidential National Drug Committee, established by President Alfonsin, would be instrumental in promoting economic support for eradication, and recommending needed changes in laws relating to punishment and other aspects of anti-trafficking laws.

Mr. Smith expressed concern over the use of Argentina for trafficking drugs to Western Europe and the need to increase airport and seaport security to intercept drugs before they leave the country. He said the United States is willing to assist in updating trafficker profiles through computer capabilities at airports and seaports.

The Argentine Delegation expressed strong support for increased interparliamentary exchanges and uniform penal codes through international treaties. A suggestion by Mr. Becarra for such a bilateral treaty with the United States was endorsed by all present.

Raul Alconada, Undersecretary, Foreign Ministry, and Jaime Malamud, Executive Director, National Drug Commission, Argentina (September 17)

On Tuesday, September 17, 1985, Argentina's Undersecretary for Latin American Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Raul F.M. Alconada, and Jaime Malamud, Narcotics Advisor to Argentine President Alfonsin, met with Representatives Lawrence Coughlin and Andy Ireland. Although not a member of the Select Committee, Mr. Ireland accompanied the Select Committee on its August 1985 study mission to South America in his capacity as a member of the House Intelligence Committee.

Although Argentina has not become a major producer or consumer of narcotics, members of the Committee learned during the August study mission that it has become a drug transit route for the traffic from Bolivia and also is being used for laundering of drug assets. There are reports that cocaine processing is developing in the area of the country bordering Bolivia. The country has the potential for becoming a major haven for these illicit drug-related activities. Further, government leaders there told the Select Committee delegation that the domestic consumption of illicit drugs is increasing, especially among school children.

The Alfonsin Administration is aware of the explosion of cocaine production and trafficking in Colombia, Peru, Bolivia and to a lesser extent Brazil and the potential posed to Argentina by the spilling-over of these activities and their corruptive influences. In response to this threat the Argentine President appointed a National Drug Commission. This year, too, Argentina will host the International Drug Enforcement Conference for Latin America, sponsored by DEA.

Mr. Malamud noted that he serves as the coordinator of Argentina's Commission for the Control of Drug Abuse and Narco-Traffic (the Commission). "We are doing quite well in Argentina to keep narcotic abuse and trafficking from running rampant throughout the country considering our proximity to the drug-producing areas of the continent and our lack of resources," he said. "We do have a problem, although a relatively small one, with the use of marijuana and cocaine by the upper classes. The real problem," he contin-

ued, "is in controlling pharmacies and their illicit sale of pharmaceuticals. We need to bolster our laws regarding the pharmaceutical industry."

The region's illicit narcotics traffic does pose a threat to Argentina, however, and Mr. Malamud said he saw a real danger posed by the coca production and traffic from Bolivia spilling over into Argentina. He went on to say that Argentina has recognized the threat posed by the traffic of marijuana and coca which passes through neighboring Paraguay and which comes from, to a large degree, Brazil. He said Bolivia's coca production is a concert to Argentina, and Argentina wants very much to work with the Bolivians to help implement a crop substitution plan in that country.

The Argentine Federal Police (AFP) are being called upon to curtail and interdict the smuggling and sale of illicit drugs. However, the previous military regimes of the country did not emphasize a traditional law enforcement role for the AFP. The AFP is thus only now being developed into an effective force in Argentina's battle against drugs. Mr. Malamud noted that the AFP plans to establish a coordinated working relationship with the police forces of Bolivia, Chile and Paraguay.

Undersecretary Alconada said Argentina is optimistic that some positive things will be done based on what has already transpired in Bolivia and Peru with their new presidents. He said the challenge in nations such as these is not only the control of production but also the most politically viable means to transform the economies and societies of these nations away from the acquired dependency upon coca production. He said Argentina and all of her neighbors in South America have the political will to combat the narcotics problem in conjunction with the United States which must help in the way of providing equipment and technical resources.

Italian Interparliamentary Committee on the Mafia (October 4)

On Friday, October 4, 1985, the Select Committee met with members of the Interparliamentary Committee on the Mafia of the Italian Parliament. Anti-Mafia and anti-narcotics cooperative efforts are considered bright spots in U.S. bilateral relations with Italy. All of those attending gave assurances of increased cooperation in fighting drug trafficking as well as in exchanging intelligence between respective police forces and judges and in educating one another about the workings of the Mafia in each country.

Attending from the Select Committee were Representative Akaka, who presided, and Representative Chappie. Representative John Conyers also attended. Those participating in the meeting from the Interparliamentary Committee were Abdon Alinovi, Chairman; Francesco Cafarelli; Filippo Fiorino; Sergio Flamigni; Antonio Mannino; Claudio D'Angelo, magistrate; Giovanni Salese, advisor; and Franco Mistretta, Italian embassy officer

With the demise of the "French Connection" in 1973, Italy's role as an illicit manufacturing and transit center for heroin increased dramatically. This activity was mainly conducted in Sicily by well established Mafia narcotic trafficking organizations. During this time, morphine base reached Italy from sources in Syria, Lebanon and Jordan. Ostensibly due to increased enforcement activity and

the enactment of the Anti-Mafia law, heroin manufacturing activity was significantly curtailed between 1978 and 1983.

Today Italy serves as an active in-transit country for shipments of both Southwest and Southeast Asian heroin for markets in Europe and North America. While heroin laboratory activity in Italy seems to have been curtailed, the availability of processed heroin from Southwest and Southeast Asian source countries ensures a supply for both domestic abuse and export.

The members of the Italian Interparliamentary Committee noted in the course of the meeting that some 80 per cent of the heroin that goes through Sicily for distribution to Europe and the United States is controlled by the Italian and U.S. Mafia. They said that Italian authorities are able to seize only 10 per cent of the illicit narcotics which are estimated to be within the country at a given time.

After welcoming remarks by Representatives Akaka, Chappie and Conyers, and an explanation of the work of the Select Committee, Chairman Alinovi explained the work of the Interparliamentary Committee on the Mafia. The Committee's mandate calls for the Committee to report to the Italian Parliament regarding the international dimensions of organized crime and methods used by countries around the world to fight it. The Committee begins its examination of the topic with the United States. Italy and the United States have experienced excellent cooperation in this area which can serve as a model for the world, he said.

Mr. Alinovi said the Committee was established in September of 1982 by what is known as the Rignone Law named for an opposition leader killed 100 days prior to the law's enactment. The Committee implements and oversees the implementation of this law.

The Committee has 40 members, 20 senators and 20 deputies, whose jurisdiction encompasses organized crime and narcotics production and trafficking matters affecting Italy.

Chairman Alinovi noted that two recently enacted statutes are presently being used by the Italian authorities in their work against the Mafia. The first makes the act of belonging to the Mafia or the use of threats of violence, intimidation or corruption punishable as a crime. "It is crime by association at which the law is aimed," according to Chairman Alinovi. The second, the one "most feared by the Mafia," is the newly enacted forfeiture law. Modeled after the American statute, it allows for financial investigations and the confiscation of Mafia assets.

A question and answer period followed with Representative Akaka concluding the meeting by noting that drug production, trafficking and abuse is, "a global problem we face and it will only be brought under control with the best cooperative efforts of the peoples and governments of the world. Neither the United States or Italy can fight drug production and trafficking alone. On behalf of the Select Committee and Chairman Charles B. Rangel, I look forward to our interparliamentary efforts."

General Edison Garces Pozo, Commander General, Ecuadorian National Police (October 10)

On Thursday, October 10, 1985, the Select Committee met with General Edison Garces Pozo, Commanding General of the Ecuadorian National Police, and Major Efrain Ramirez, Aide-de-Camp to General Garces. This meeting was a follow-up of earlier meetings which had occurred between Members of the Select Committee and Ecuador's President, Leon Febres Cardero, and other officials of the Government of Ecuador during the Committee's Latin American study mission (August 3-19, 1985).

Based on the summer 1985 study mission, the Select Committee reported the following as some of its findings and recommendations:

—President Febres Cordero emphasized his commitment to preserving democratic institutions and combatting narco-terrorism. Ecuador desperately needs U.S. assistance (it had been cut off from 1983 to September 1984) to do so.

—He stressed the need for a collective effort by the international community against drug trafficking.

—He appointed a drug czar from the military to coordinate drug law enforcement efforts in Ecuador.

—Ecuador is no longer just a transshipment state. More than 950 hectares of coca have been eradicated in Ecuador since August of 1984; 50 coca labs have been destroyed and 35 tons of ether have been imported into Ecuador.

—The National Directorate for the Control of Illicit Narcotics (DINACTE) is considered ineffective due to lack of personnel with law enforcement experience.

—The National Police need better communications equipment and helicopters. A recent joint operation with Colombian police showed the Ecuadorians to be poorly trained, funded, equipped and armed.

—The National Police are renting helicopters from the army at $1,000 per hour which is not at all cost effective. They need a leasing or purchasing arrangement with DEA or the military.

During the October 1985 meeting, General Garces restated Ecuador's need for United States support of its drug control efforts. The Select Committee, once again impressed with the sincerity of the Government of Ecuador, agreed to intensify its efforts to persuade the State Department to increase U.S. assistance to Ecuador in that country's efforts to eradicate illicit narcotics cultivation and enforce its domestic narcotics control laws.

Mario Ribadeneria, Ambassador of Ecuador to the United States (October 17)

On Thursday, October 17, 1985, the Select Committee met with Ecuador's Ambassador to the United States, Mario Ribadeneria. Participating from the Select Committee were Chairman Rangel as well as Ranking Minority Member Gilman, Representatives Towns and Guarini.

The Select Committee delegation that visited Ecuador in the course of its August 1985 study mission to South America met with the country's President Febres Cordero. The Committee was im-

pressed with his recognition of the drug problem threatening Ecuador and his determination to confront it.

There is a consensus that Ecuador has made considerable progress in combatting drug trafficking and abuse since the Febres Administration took over. Despite the commitment to this end, Ecuador desperately needs better equipment, intelligence gathering systems, training and legislation to effectively counter the increasing drug trafficking and money laundering activities in the country. It will need, however, more in the way of U.S. narcotics assistance, suspended from 1983 to September of 1984, to affect these measures.

The following exchange took place in the course of the meeting with the Ecuadorian Ambassador. Chairman Rangel opened the floor for discussion by welcoming the Ambassador and noting the following:

Throughout our travels, the Select Committee has never been more impressd with a head of state as it was with President Febres. Indeed, throughout South America we were impressed by what appears to be a growing awareness of the narcotics problem and how it has taken on international dimensions. It threatens certain governments of South America by eradicating the very Democratic underpinnings upon which they are built. Increasingly, this is being realized by those governments who are now taking steps to meet the threat.

President Febres, recognizing this phenomenon, tied Ecuador's and the region's economic crisis to drug production and trafficking and pointed out how we all need to look closely at Bolivia and Peru, the big producers of coca, and recognize the impact that this continued illicit production has on not only the economies of these two nations but upon the rest of South America as well.

Ambassador Ribadeneria thanked Chairman Rangel for his remarks but suggested that the United States, being the primary consumer of narcotics worldwide, bore as much responsibility as any for the phenomenon of illicit drug manufacture and sale. He stated, however, that Ecuador needed the continued support of and liaison with the Congress of the United States and especially that of the Select Committee membership. He said Ecuador saw the battle against narcotics as a joint effort with the United States.

Chairman Rangel concluded the meeting with the following remarks:

What we hope to do is have you come away from our meeting this morning with the idea that we have a better understanding of your problem. We on the Select Committee want to be your liaison in Congress.

You can be sure that we will be attentive. Likewise, you can be sure that we will do our part to keep the problem on the agendas of Secretary of State Shultz, Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs Abrams, Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics Matters John Thomas and our DEA.

You should not hesitate to call on us. We know that Ecuador has the least in the way of narcotics-related problems so we will do our best to understand your system. We will draw from Representative Gilman who as Ranking Minority Member of the Select Committee also serves on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

But it would he helpful to hear of what progress you are making. It makes it easier for us to help you. As a businessman and a diplomat you understand that. We have to be able to make a case for our friends. Mr. Ambassador, we want to be confident that narcotics control is on both our agendas.

Julio Garrett-Aillon, Vice President of Bolivia, Mariano Baptista, Ambassador to the United States, and Jorge Gumeio, Ambassador of Bolivia to the United Nations (October 18)

On October 18, 1985, Chairman Rangel had a breakfast meeting at the Bolivian Embassy with Vice President Julio Garrett-Aillon; Bolivia's Ambassador to the United States, Mariano Baptista; and its Ambassador to the United Nations, Jorge Gumeio. Vice President Aillon stressed that the Government of Bolivian President Paz is committed to fighting narcoterrorism. He warned Mr. Rangel that by imposing sanctions against Bolivia the United States could further jeopardize Bolivia's fragile economy, and have the opposite effect of what it intends. He said that consideration should be given to creation of an international police force under the auspices of the United Nations to eradicate coca cultivation in Bolivia. Chairman Rangel called this idea "dramatic." Vice President Aillon said Bolivia realizes the seriousness of the drug problem, and he would work personally to see that something is done about the problem.

Chairman Rangel told Vice President Aillon that the survival of Bolivian democracy is critical to the survival of other South American democracies. The only way Congress has to encourage Bolivia to take some action against narcoterrorism is to pass legislation imposing sanctions against Bolivia. He requested that Ambassador Baptista keep him informed about what is happening in Bolivia. He said the American people were putting pressure on their representatives in Congress to take action against narcotics production in Bolivia and other countries but that Congress and the State Department were willing to work with Bolivia to fashion successful narcotics eradication policies.

Chairman Rangel expressed concern for the future of the narcotics problem in Brazil. Mr. Gilman pointed to the fact that marijuana and cocaine production were on the rise as evidenced by increased seizures, and he expressed particular concern over the cultivation of coca (epadu) in the Amazon region. The Ambassador indicated that the increased seizures were the result of greatly increased surveillance by the Government of Brazil.

The meeting concluded on a note of mutual support for joint efforts to solve the problems Brazil faces; increased support for the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC) by the Government of Brazil, and efforts to assist in helping the Brazilian Parliament in creating a body similar to the Select Committee in solving its problems.

Sergio Correa de Costa, Ambassador of Brazil (October 23)

On October 23, 1985, Brazilian Ambassador to the United States Correa de Costa met with Chairman Charles B. Rangel and Ranking Minority Member Benjamin A. Gilman. The meeting was one of a series of meetings with foreign officials representing the seven nations visited by the Select Committee on its South American study mission in August.

Chairman Rangel expressed concern and strong support for close working relationships with all of our South American neighbors,

and he stressed the need for cooperative efforts on social and economic problems as well as narcotics.

Mr. Gilman highlighted four areas of concern to the Select Committee:

The need for efforts to prevent precursor chemicals from reaching neighboring drug producing nations;

Continued efforts at eradication and laboratory confiscation in the Amazon region;

The development of a strong working relationship between the United States and Brazil on narcotics control efforts;

Increased river patrols on the Amazon.

Ambassador de Costa assured the Select Committee that Brazil fully recognized the problems and intended to continue to intensify its eradication efforts as well as its efforts to prevent Brazil from being used as a transit country. He added that drug production, trafficking, and abuse were new to Brazil, and while production was estimated to be minimal, there was indeed potential for growth. He added that they were coordinating their anti-narcotics efforts through an Interministerial Committee, but there was no direct U.N. or U.S. support for the Committee.

Dr. Giovanni Falcone, Investigating Magistrate, Palermo, Italy (November 14)

On November 14, 1985, Chairman Rangel met in his congressional office with Dr. Giovanni Falcone, Investigating Magistrate, Palermo, Italy, to discuss U.S.-Italian narcotics issues. Dr. Falcone is an Italian Judge who specializes in narcotics and organized crime cases. Congressmen Frank Guarini and Peter Rodino also participated in the meeting. Representatives of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Drug Enforcement Administration accompanied Dr. Falcone to the meeting.

Dr. Falcone met with Chairman Rangel to maintain contact because of their respective positions in the battle against narcotics. American and Italian authorities are working together to incarcerate members of the Mafia involved in narcotics trafficking. Dr. Falcone stressed the importance of this effort and the need to continue it in the future.

Activities in Support of Legislative Initiatives

STATE AND LOCAL NARCOTICS CONTROL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1985

(H.R. 526)

On January 7, 1985, Chairman Rangel and Mr. Gilman were joined by 31 Members of Congress, including 14 members of the Select Committee on Narcotics in introducing H.R. 526, the State and Local Narcotics Control Assistance Act of 1985. This legislation was identical to H.R. 5990 which was introduced by Mr. Rangel and Select Committee members in the 98th Congress.

H.R. 526 would authorize $750 million annually in fiscal years 1986 through 1990 to assist State and local governments in narcotics law enforcement and drug abuse prevention and treatment activities. The funds would be made available to the States on the

basis of need, taking into account the severity of drug trafficking and abuse within a State and the availability of State and local resources to tackle these problems.

The funds provided under the bill would be allocated as follows:

The bill authorizes the Attorney General to make grants to States to improve all components of State and local criminal justice systems—police, prosecutors, courts and prisons. Funds are available for five general purposes related to increasing the level of State and local law enforcement. These purposes include:

Providing additional personnel, equipment, facilities, training, and supplies to State and local narcotics enforcement units for more widespread apprehension of drug criminals;

Providing similar support to increase the prosecution of narotics cases in State courts;

Providing additional support to State courts to increase the number of narcotics cases that can be adjudicated and reduce delays that often leave drug peddlers free to ply their trade pending trial;

Increasing the capacity of State correctional facilities to hold convicted drug felons and providing support to establish and improve drug treatment and rehabilitation services for drug dependent State offenders; and

Providing increased support for States to eradicate illicit drug production.

The bill includes $125 million a year for each of these five general purposes (totalling $625 million annually). It also gives the Attorney General limited flexibility to shift funds among these purposes. This will allow the Attorney General to increase funds available for purposes that have a greater need. However, the amount available for each purpose cannot be increased or decreased by more than 10 percent.

The bill also authorizes the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make grants to States to increase the availability of drug abuse prevention, treatment and rehabilitation programs. The bill authorizes $125 million annually for this purpose. Grants under this program would be available to States on the basis of need for more effective drug abuse prevention, treatment and rehabilitation programs, the availability of State and local resources to satisfy such need, and the recommendations of the Attorney General regarding those populations and areas which have or are likely to have an exceptional need for such programs and activities as a result of increased law enforcement efforts.

On March 20, 1985, Chairman Rangel and Mr. Gilman appeared before the House Budget Committee to urge that committee to include in the Administration of Justice and Health Functions of the 1986 budget resolution the amounts authorized in H.R. 526 to help States and localities increase their efforts to control drug trafficking.

Mr. Rangel argued that it has become imperative for the Federal Government to come to the assistance of State and local governments in tackling drug abuse and drug-related crime, a problem that is largely a Federal responsibility. Both Mr. Rangel and Mr. Gilman noted that the tremendous quantities of drugs available in the U.S. today are the results of failures at the Federal level—the

failure of diplomatic efforts to control the production and trafficking of illegal drugs abroad and the failure of Federal interdiction and enforcement efforts to restrict the entry and distribution of narcotics domestically.

The Chairman pointed out that while State and local governments are powerless to stop the production of drugs abroad, and can do little to halt the smuggling of illegal drugs into the U.S., the heavy burden of coping with the difficult and costly problems drugs cause falls largely on the shoulders of State and local governments.

Local police, prosecutors, judges, jails, and prisons have all been overwhelmed by a continous surge of drug-related criminal defendants. The criminal justice system, as a result, has been forced to make the critical decisions of arrest, bail, probation, and sentence based on the size of the case load. Drug trafficking has forced local criminal justice systems to be concerned with the quantity of defendants, rather than the quality of justice.

States and localities are also simply unable to meet the growing demand for drug abuse treatment and prevention services. This is especially true in many of our nation's large urban areas that are hardest hit by drug abuse. The need for drug abuse services far outstrips the capacity of State and local governments to respond, but Federal assistance to help States and localities provide such services has been cut by over 40 percent in recent years under the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Services Block Grant.

Mr. Rangel and Mr. Gilman concluded their presentation before the Budget Committee by stating that, "It is time we recognized that bringing the problems of drug abuse and drug trafficking under control will require a serious, long-term commitment of substantial resources. We can afford to do no less."

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION ACT OF 1985 (H.R. 1555)

During House consideration of H.R. 1555, the foreign aid authorization for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, Chairman Rangel offered an amendment to restrict the provision of foreign assistance to Bolivia and Peru. The amendment was supported by Ranking Minority Member Gilman, and other members of the Select Committee.

Mr. Rangel's amendment prohibited future U.S. assistance to Bolovia and Peru, except humanitarian aid, unless the President certified to Congress that each country had developed and was implementing a plan in accordance with the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs to eliminate illicit coca production and that each country was reducing its illegal coca production by 10 percent a year. In proposing his amendment, Mr. Rangel said the time had come to stop funding programs in Bolivia and Peru until those countries took effective action to reduce their steadily increasing illicit coca production. He pointed out that the availability and use of cocaine had risen dramatically in the United States. He noted that coca production in Bolivia and Peru was responsible for at least 90 percent of the cocaine that ultimately reached the United States. He said that Peru had failed to take any steps to eradicate illicit coca production except in the Upper Huallaga Valley where, despite U.S. assistance, Peru had failed to effectively carry out the

crop substitution and coca eradication program it proposed in 1981. He also said that Bolivia had failed to undertake any coca eradication efforts despite agreements Bolivia signed with the United States in 1983 to initiate eradication. Finally, he pointed out that Bolivia's and Peru's failure to eradicate illicit coca cultivation violated international agreements as well as bilateral commitments with the United States.

During floor debate on the bill, Mr. Rangel worked with Chairman Fascell of the Foreign Affairs Committee and Representative Lawrence J. Smith, head of the House Foreign Affairs Task Force on International Narcotics Control, who both serve on the Select Committee as well, to fashion a substitute to the Rangel amendment. The compromise was reached in response to some Members' concerns that it would not be appropriate to impose too harsh sanctions against the new, democratically elected governments about to be installed in Bolivia and Peru.

The substitute conditioned economic support funds (ESF) and military assistance to Bolivia, and all U.S. aid (except narcotics and humanitarian assistance) to Peru, on the accomplishment by those countries of certain anti-narcotics measures. For 1986, the substitute permitted Bolivia to receive 50 percent of its ESF and military assistance funds only after the President certified to Congress that Bolivia had enacted legislation to establish its legal coca requirements, license the number of hectares needed to produce the legal crop, and make unlicensed production illegal. The remainder of this aid could be provided only if the President further certified that Bolivia had achieved the calendar year 1985 eradication target contained in its 1983 narcotics agreement with the United States (4,000 hectares by the end of calendar year 1985). For 1987, no such aid could be provided to Bolivia until the President certified that Bolivia had developed a plan to eradicate illicit coca production throughout its territory and was prepared to enter into an agreement with the United States to implement the plan. Then, up to 50 percent of such aid could be provided after the President certified that Bolivia had achieved half of the 1986 eradication target, and the remainder could be provided upon further certification that the entire eradication goal for 1986 had been achieved.

With respect to Peru, the substitute permitted no U.S. aid in 1986 unless the President reported to Congress that Peru had demonstrated substantial progress toward developing a plan to establish its legal coca requirements, license the number of hectares needed to produce the legal requirements, and eliminate illicit coca production. For 1987, the substitute amendment permitted U.S. aid to Peru only if the President reported to Congress that Peru had developed its plan and was implementing it.

In accepting the more moderate substitute amendment, Mr. Rangel noted the recent elections in Bolivia and Peru. He said, "They start with new governments and hopefully with new initiatives in order to do something about this serious problem [of illicit coca and cocaine production and traffic]." Continuing, however, he said the House stood ready to implement "even harsher and more strict legislation" if Bolivia and Peru failed to make serious efforts to eradicate illicit coca cultivation.

The Rangel amendment, as amended by the substitute, passed the House by voice vote. In conference, the Senate accepted the House language. The President approved the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985 with the Rangel amendment on August 8, 1985 (P.L. 99-830, sections 611 and 612).

MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO CIVILIAN DRUG INTERDICTION EFFORTS

In 1985, Members of the Select Committee supported a number of legislative efforts to increase military support for Federal civilian agencies responsible for patrolling our borders against drug smuggling. There activites are described below.

a. Readiness Enhancement of Air Force Reserve Special Operations Act of 1985 (H.R. 1307)

In February, Representative Glenn English, Chairman of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Government Information, Justice, and Agriculture, and Senator Dennis DeConcini introduced companion bills (H.R. 1307, S. 531) to establish an Air Force Reserve Special Operations wing within the Defense Department to assist in drug interdiction efforts. This special unit, to consist of 16 P-3 aircraft equipped with appropriate radar, was designed to detect drug smuggling aircraft attempting to penetrate the southern border of the United States. The bills were intended to bolster Defense support for civilian drug interdiction operations within the limits of existing Posse Comitatus restrictions.

At a February 27 press conference to announce the introduction of the measures, Chairman Rangel, Ranking Minority Member Gilman and other Select Committee Members joined Rep. English and Senator DeConcini to strongly support enactment of the legislation. Language reflecting the substance of H.R. 1307 ultimately was included in section 1422 of S. 1160, the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (P.L. 99-145).

b. Easing Posse Comitatus Restrictions—H.R. 2553, the Military Drug Interdiction Assistance Act

On April 24, 1985, the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime held a hearing to assess the need for further modifications to the Posse Comitatus Act which prohibits the use of the military in law enforcement unless there is a specific statutory or constitutional exception. Amendments adopted in 1981 permit certain indirect military support for law enforcement operations. Specifically, the amendments allow for military cooperation with civilian law enforcement officials to the extent of providing intelligence information collected in the course of military operations; the use of military equipment and facilities; training and advice to civilian law enforcement personnel; and permission for military personnel to operate and maintain military equipment in the hands of civilian law enforcement agencies. Such assistance may be given only when defense readiness is not affected, and is provided subject to reimbursement when military funds are not available for that purpose.

Members of Congress testifying before the Crime Subcommittee included Select Committee Chairman Charles B. Rangel and Rank-

ing Minority Member Benjamin A. Gilman, Representative Charles E. Bennett of Florida and Representative Glenn English of Oklahoma. Other witnesses included New York City Major Edward I. Koch and Lieutenant General R. Dean Tice, U.S. Army, Director of the Department of Defense Task Force on Drug Enforcement.

In testifying before the subcommittee, Mr. Rangel and Mr. Gilman said the 1981 amendments had been somewhat helpful in encouraging increased military support for drug interdiction efforts. They stressed, however, that despite increased cooperation from the military, illicit drugs continued to pour into the United States in record amounts and that drug enforcement agencies were being overwhelmed in their fight against highly sophisticated, well-equipped and well-financed drug trafficking operations. While shunning a direct role for the military in domestic drug enforcement, ways had to be found, they said, to expand military assistance to civilian drug interdiction operations. They told the subcommittee that the military has the manpower, equipment and resources to make a significant difference in this effort. To have any hope of victory in the war against drugs, full cooperative efforts with the military must be utilized, they said.

Subsequently, on May 21, Mr. Bennett introduced H.R. 2553, the Military Drug Interdiction Assistance Act. He was joined by Chairman Rangel, Ranking Minority Member Gilman and Representative E. Clay Shaw, Jr., of the Select Committee, and Representative G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery of the Armed Services Committee.

The bill expanded the military's role in drug interdiction by authorizing members of the Armed Forces to assist Federal civilian enforcement officials in drug searches, seizures and arrests outside the land area of the United States. The primary purpose of the bill was to permit the Navy, when requested by a Federal drug enforcement agency, to interdict suspected drug smuggling vessels. The bill was intended to enable the military to participate more effectively in our Nation's efforts to combat narcotics trafficking without compromising military readiness or authorizing excessive military involvement in civilian law enforcement. To this end, the bill allowed such assistance by the military only if military preparedness would not be adversely affected and only if Federal drug enforcement officials maintained ultimate control over any operation carried out with military involvement. The bill also carefully limited the military's search, seizure and arrest authority only to areas outside the land area of the United States. No domestic drug searches, seizures and arrests were authorized.

The substance of H.R. 2553 was incorporated by the House in H.R. 1872, the fiscal year 1986 Department of Defense authorization bill. Mr. Bennett offered H.R. 2553 as an amendment during floor debate on the Defense authorization measure. The House passed the amendment on June 26 by the wide margin of 364–18. Several members of the Select Committee participated actively in the vigorous debate on the Bennett amendment.

The Senate's version of the Defense authorization bill did not include a similar provision. In July, Chairman Rangel wrote to Senator Sam Nunn urging him and the Senate conferees on the military spending bill to support the Bennett amendment. The conference committee reached a compromise that authorized an addition-

al $15 million for 500 new Coast Guard law enforcement personnel to serve on Navy vessels sailing in drug interdiction areas (section 1421, Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986, P.L. 99-145). This in effect expanded an existing cooperative arrangement under which Coast Guard law enforcement teams were being assigned on board Navy vessels operating in drug smuggling waters to carry out enforcement actions against any drug smugglers encountered.

c. E-2 Aircraft in Drug Interdiction

The Department of Defense Authorization Act for 1986 also included a provision to increase military support for drug interdiction added by Representative Duncan Hunter of California, a member of the Select Committee. Section 1424 required the Navy to conduct a test along the southwest border with Mexico to determine the effectiveness of E-2 aircraft in drug interdiction.

NARCOTICS CONTROL TRADE ACT (H.R. 3404)

On September 20, 1985, Chairman Rangel and Mr. Gilman introduced H.R. 3404, the Narcotics Control Trade Act. The objective of this bill is to deny most-favored-nation trade status to drug producing and trafficking nations that do not cooperate with the U.S. in curbing illicit narcotics production and trafficking.

Under H.R. 3404, most-favored-nation trade status would be denied when the President determined that a country is not cooperating with the U.S. to control and eliminate the illicit cultivation and production of illicit narcotics, psychotropic drugs and other controlled substances, or suppress the illicit trafficking and smuggling of such substances.

Presidential determinations regarding the trade status of drug producing and trafficking nations would be made to the Congress at the beginning of each fiscal year. According to H.R. 3404, the determination of ineligibility for most-favored-nation trade status would continue until the President notifies Congress that the drug source nation had made significant progress, and will continue to do so, in remedying the situation or lack of action that led to the designation.

On October 11, 1985, Mr. Rangel wrote to Chairman Sam Gibbons of the House Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee urging quick action on H.R. 3404. "The Narcotics Control Trade Act will send a clear signal from the Congress and the American people to the legitimate economies of drug producing nations: their goods will not be favorably regarded by our nation unless their governments take effective steps to proscribe illicit drug production and trafficking," Rangel wrote Gibbons. He also noted in his letter to Chairman Gibbons that H.R. 3404 had been cosponsored by over 20 Members of Congress.

MAIL ORDER DRUG PARAPHERNALIA CONTROL ACT (H.R. 1625)

On March 20, 1985, Representative Mel Levine, a member of the Select Committee introduced H.R. 1625, the Mail Order Drug Paraphernalia Act. Mr. Levine was joined in introducing this bill by Chairman Rangel and Mr. Gilman. Companion legislation was in-

65-444 0 - 86 - 7

troduced the same day in the Senate by Senator Pete Wilson of California.

H.R. 1625 is aimed at prohibiting the sale through the mails or in interstate commerce items that can only be used in connection with drug abuse. The bill provides fines up to $100,000 and imprisonment of up to three years for violation of its provisions.

The legislation was introduced in response to the fact that notwithstanding local and State drug paraphernalia laws have been successful in closing down "headshops" and halting the local retail sale of drug paraphernalia, manufacturers, dealers and sellers of drug paraphernalia have created a very lucrative business in the sale of drug paraphernalia in the mails, or through private delivery services. Most sales are advertised in catalogs and magazines.

In introducing this bill, Mr. Levine noted that, "The unregulated sale of drug paraphernalia through the mails and in interstate commerce glamorizes the drug culture and encourages drug experimentation by children and adolescents." By banning the sale of mail order paraphernalia we will reduce the access to such aids, and decrease the number of drug abusers, Levine added.

Reps. Rangel and Gilman noted at the time that the bill was introduced that the Select Committee has been active on the drug paraphernalia issue since 1979 when it held hearings that led to the enactment of model state statutes to ban local retail sales of these devices. H.R. 1625 would provide Federal support for the efforts of State and local law enforcement agencies in controlling the availability of illegal paraphernalia at the local level by halting the interstate transfer of such items.

FEDERAL DRUG LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENT PROTECTION ACT OF 1985 (H.R. 2013)

The body of Enrique Camarena Salazar, a Drug Enforcement Administration Agent serving in Mexico was discovered in February 1985. He was abducted and subsequently murdered by Mexican drug traffickers. In response to this event, Chairman Rangel introduced H.R. 2013, Federal Drug Law Enforcement Agent Protection Act of 1985. This bill is identical to S. 630, which had been introduced by Senator Paula Hawkins (R-FL), and passed by the Senate on March 20, 1985. This bill provides that the Assets Forfeiture Fund of the Department of Justice would be used to pay awards of up to $100,000 to any individual who provides original information which leads to the arrest and conviction of a person who kills or kidnaps a Federal drug law enforcement agent.

On October 17, 1985, the House Committee on the Judiciary, Crime Subcommittee, held a hearing on H.R. 2013 and other similar bills. At the hearing Chairman Rangel urged the Subcommittee to fashion a new tool to help the Drug Enforcement Administration combat international terrorism. He noted the adverse effect which drug trafficking has had on many fragile democracies in the Americas. He said that he was flexible as to the ultimate bill agreed to by the Subcommittee, and that he could support payment of rewards out of a congressional appropriation, rather than from the Assets Forfeiture Fund of the Department of Justice.

Ms. Victoria Toensing, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, said "we have serious reservations about some aspects of H.R. 2013 and S. 630 . . . we respectfully oppose opening up the Fund for any other purposes, even those as laudable as intended by H.R. 2013 and S. 630."

The Members of the Crime Subcommittee are currently working to produce a consensus bill on payment of rewards to informants. Readers of this report are directed to the section which discusses H.R. 2768, the "Narcoterrorism Information Rewards Act of 1985," which is a similar bill to H.R. 2013. Thirteen Members of the Select Committee have joined Chairman Rangel as cosponsors of H.R. 2013, including Congressmen Gilman, Hunter, Smith, Akaka, Strang, Matsui, Guarini, Ortiz, DioGuardi, Shaw, Scheuer, Oxley, and Towns.

NARCOTERRORISM INFORMATION REWARDS ACT OF 1985 (H.R. 2768)

H.R. 2768, "Narcoterrorism Information Rewards Act of 1985," was introduced on June 13, 1985, by Congressman Tom Lewis (R-FL). Like H.R. 2013 sponsored by Chairman Rangel, it is a response to the kidnapping and murder of DEA Agent Enrique Camarena Salazar. H.R. 2768 was written taking into account the views of the Department of Justice.

H.R. 2768 would establish a separate $5 million fund to pay rewards to individuals who provide information leading to the arrest or conviction of individuals who conspire to, or kill or kidnap U.S. Government officers or employees in the performance of, or because of, their drug law enforcement duties. It would authorize payment of a reward for information on terrorist acts against immediate family members of drug law enforcement officers and employees, and authorize payment of a reward for information that prevents an attempt to kill or kidnap any of these individuals. H.R. 2768 would authorize without fiscal year limitation $5 million to pay rewards. It provides that rewards over $100,000 could only be made upon the personal approval of the Attorney General. It would provide that any individual who furnishes information which would justify payment of a reward could in the discretion of the Attorney General be included in the witness security program of the Federal Government. Finally, the Attorney General would be required to consult with the Secretary of State before making any reward to a person outside the United States.

Chairman Rangel is a cosponsor of H.R. 2768, and testified he could support it at the October 17, 1985, hearing held by the Crime Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee. Six other Members of the Select Committee are cosponsors of H.R. 2768, including Congressmen Gilman, Smith, Shaw, Ortiz, DioGuardi, and Matsui. The Members of the Crime Subcommittee will consider the provisions of H.R. 2768 in the process of drafting a consensus Subcommittee bill on payment of rewards to informants.

At the October 17, 1985, hearing, Congressman Lewis, who is a former member of the Select Committee on Narcotics, testified "Camarena's death should show us how far terrorists will go to protect their income. A reward bill is a vital step in the right direction, which should have been taken long ago." Ms. Victoria Toensing,

Deputy Assistant Attorney General Criminal Division, said that the Department of Justice favored enactment of H.R. 2768 over the other bills because of the coverage of family members, and because it "clearly applies to any Federal official involved in drug enforcement without regard to whether the official is employed by a drug enforcement agency." She said DOJ also favored H.R. 2768 because it would provide the "Attorney General shall consult with the Secretary of State before making any reward under this Act to a person outside the United States." She said it was DOJ's position that "rewards should be paid only for information which leads to prosecutions and convictions. A more liberal policy for paying of rewards would lead to unproductive information and (be) a waste of time."

DESIGNER DRUGS

Designer drugs are analogs or chemical cousins, of controlled substances that are designed to produce effects similar to the controlled substances they mimic. By slightly altering the chemical formula of a controlled substance, such as by adding a floride or extra carbon molecule, a new drug is created which will produce the high or euphoria the user wants. Until they are regulated under the Controlled Substances Act, the production of designer drugs are completely legal. By slightly altering the chemical structure of a designer drug a chemist can stay one step ahead of the law.

Other problems associated with designer drugs are that the possible analogs of dangerous controlled substances are virtually limitless. Since designer drugs are produced in clandestine laboratories, they are hard to detect, and they are not subject to quality controls on potency or purity, thus exposing users to unknown dangers. They are cheap to make and the profits to be realized enormous. It is reported that less than $500 worth of chemicals and equipment can produce a cup of "China White" a synthetic heroin worth $2 million on the illicit market.

On July 18, 1985, Chairman Charles B. Rangel testified before the Senate Budget Committee ". . . I was extremely pleased when the Administration submitted new legislation to the Congress . . . to make designer drugs illegal. The bill (S. 1437) would establish new criminal penalties for the production and trafficking in designer drugs. Under this proposal, designer drug violations would be punishable by fines up to $250,000 and prison terms up to 15 years. I am encouraged by the Administration's action, and I believe our legislation was an important factor in making the Administration realize the depth of Congressional concern about this issue."

On April 4, 1985, Chairman Rangel introduced H.R. 2014, which is a companion measure to S. 746, which was introduced by Senator Lawton Chiles (D–FL), on March 26, 1985. Mr. Gilman, the Ranking Minority Member of the Select Committee on Narcotics is a cosponsor of H.R. 2014. Both bills would require the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board to provide a comprehensive assessment of the designer drug problem and make recommendations to Congress for necessary legislation. The following 14 Select Committee Members are cosponsors of H.R. 2014: Congressman Gilman, Faunt-

roy, Smith, Akaka, Fascell, Levine, Parris, Matsui, DioGuardi, Ortiz, Guarini, Scheuer, Oxley, and Towns.

The Committee notes with approval the passage of S. 1437, the "Controlled Substance Analogs Enforcement Act of 1985" by the U.S. Senate on December 18, 1985. S. 1437 has been referred to the House Committees on Energy and Commerce and Judiciary.

NATIONAL DRUG AND ALCOHOL EDUCATION ACT OF 1985 (H.R. 380)

H.R. 380, "National Drug and Alcohol Education Act of 1985" was introduced on January 3, 1985, by Congressman Solomon Ortiz (D-TX) and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. Mr. Ortiz is a member of the Select Committee on Narcotics. The bill would authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services acting through the Administrator of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, to provide grants to States to assist local education agencies in establishing and improving drug, alcohol, and tobacco education programs for elementary and secondary school students. Grant recipients would be required to provide students with thorough education on drug, alcohol, and tobacco use and abuse, including the physical, social, and legal consequences. The States would pay 20 percent of the cost of drug, alcohol, and tobacco education programs, and localities would pay 5 percent of the cost, with the Federal Government paying 75 percent of the cost of such programs. H.R. 380 would authorize to be appropriated to the Secretary of Health and Human Services $10 million annually for each of the fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987 to fund drug, alcohol, and tobacco education programs.

Twelve members of the Select Committee are cosponsors of this legislation. Cosponsors include Chairman Rangel, and Congressmen Gilman, Guarini, Smith, Towns, Levine, Chappie, Fauntroy, Hughes, Coughlin, Matsui, and Congresswoman Cardiss Collins.

FUNDING FOR DEA MID-ATLANTIC LABORATORY (H.R. 3552)

In October 1985, the Washington Post reported that over 100 misdemeanor drug cases, and possibly as many as several hundred, had been dismissed in the District of Columbia in the past six months because chemical analysis reports of suspected drug samples had not been completed in time by the Drug Enforcement Administration's mid-Atlantic laboratory. In some cases, the Post reported, charges had been dropped against defendants who had pleaded guilty because the necessary analyses were not ready. In drug cases, the chemical analysis report is the key evidence as to whether a substance is an illegal drug.

Police and prosecutors told the Post that these dismissals, averaging a dozen or more each week, were "putting a serious crimp in their battle against crime."

DEA officials admitted to the Post that the agency's mid-Atlantic laboratory in Washington, D.C., had a backlog of about 1,200 samples and was falling further behind. They attributed the growing delays to the "failure of federal funding to keep pace with the skyrocketing number of drug cases" being brought in the District. The 9,400 cases brought in 1984 were more than double the number in 1979.

In response to this serious impediment to drug enforcement in the nation's capital, Chairman Charles B. Rangel, Ranking Minority Member Benjamin A. Gilman, and D.C. Delegate Walter E. Fauntroy on October 10, 1985, introduced H.R. 3552 to authorize additional funding for the DEA's mid-Atlantic laboratory. The bill authorized additional appropriations of $925,000 for the DEA in fiscal year 1986. This amount included funds for the additional personnel and operating expenses needed by the DEA's mid-Atlantic laboratory to provide timely analyses of suspected drug samples submitted by the District's Metropolitan Police Department. The measure was referred to the Judiciary Committee.

PRECURSOR AND ESSENTIAL CHEMICALS REVIEW ACT OF 1985

(H.R. 3819)

On November 21, 1985, Chairman Rangel introduced H.R. 3819, "Precursor and Essential Chemicals Review Act of 1985." Under the bill the Attorney General would be required to conduct a study of the need for legislation, regulation, or alternative methods to control the diversion of legitimate precursor and essential chemicals in the illegal production of drugs of abuse, and report all findings to Congress within ninety days of the date of enactment of this Act. The bill was referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary, but there was no legislative activity on the bill in 1985. At the close of the first session of the 99th Congress, on December 20, 1985, the bill was cosponsored by Ranking Minority Member Benjamin Gilman and District of Columbia Delegate Walter Fauntroy.

Senator Lawton Chiles (D–FL), introduced S. 1746, the Senate counterpart to H.R. 3819, on October 8, 1985. There was no legislative activity on S. 1746, it is pending in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

NATIONAL DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION WEEK (H.J. RES. 126)

H.J. Res. 126, which designated the week of November 3, 1985, through November 9, 1985, as "National Drug Abuse Education Week", was introduced by Congressman Charles Bennett (D–FL) on February 6, 1985. It passed the House of Representatives on October 30, 1985. It passed the Senate on November 4, 1985. Congressman Bennett wrote to Congressman Robert Garcia, Chairman, Subcommittee on Census and Population, House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: "Since drug production in foreign nations continues to increase, it is imperative that we encourage drug users in the United States, especially our young people, to stop using drugs. An effective drug abuse education program is one of the best means to accomplish this." Chairman Rangel actively supported Congressman Bennett in his efforts to get H.J. Res. 126 enacted into law, 22 member of the Select Committee were cosponsors of this legislation. These include Chairman Rangel, and Congressmen Gilman, Rodino, Hunter, Scheuer, Shaw, Levine, Akaka, DioGuardi, Strang, Hughes, Matsui, Smith, Guarini, Fauntroy, Coughlin, Towns, Ortiz, Rowland, Stark, Chappie, and Congresswoman Cardiss Collins.

EXEMPTION OF THE BAHAMAS FROM THE MANSFIELD AMENDMENT

(H.R. 962)

On Wednesday, February 6, 1985, Representative Glenn English introduced a bill to make an exception to that part of the Foreign Assistance Act (Sec. 481(c)) which prohibits the DEA, Customs and Coast Guard from engaging in certain foreign arrest actions and interrogations. This prohibition is commonly called the Mansfield Amendment. Representative English's bill, H.R. 962, would exempt from its coverage the Bahamas, in order that United States law enforcement personnel might better assist authorities there stem the flow of illicit narcotics into and out of the islands.

The Mansfield Amendment enacted in 1976 and amended in 1978 reads as follows:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no officer or employee of the United States may engage or participate in any direct police arrest action in any foreign country with respect to narcotics control efforts. No such officer or employee may interrogate or be present during the interrogation of any United States person arrested in any foreign country with respect to narcotics control efforts without the written consent of such person. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to the activities of the United States Armed Forces in carrying out their responsibilities under applicable Status of Forces arrangements. (22 USC Sec. 2291(c)).

This amendment was a reaction to U.S. involvement in Vietnam. The Senate noted on February 5, 1976, during the debate on the original amendment that it was an attempt, to reconcile two important U.S. interests; motivating foreign governments to cooperate to the fullest degree in stopping drugs from reaching the United States and avoiding excessive U.S. intervention in the internal affairs of the nations designed to prevent American involvement where it is unnecessary to our own domestic drug enforcement programs and where friction with foreign governments is likely to result.

Representative English noted the following reasons for proposing H.R. 962. (1) The Bahamas has emerged as the prime transit center for huge amounts of illicit drugs entering the United States. (2) Bahamian waters and air space closely abut the U.S. making timely coordination of interdiction operations extremely difficult. (3) The Bahamian Government is unable to mount sophisticated air or marine drug interdiction operations. (4) The Operation BAT concept, utilizing Bahamian and U.S. personnel and equipment against air smugglers in the Bahamas, should be expanded to include marine operations which the Mansfield Amendment prohibits.

Chairman Rangel in agreeing to cosponsor H.R. 962 noted that it would:

> Remove a great obstacle from our law enforcement agencies empowered to interdict the narcotics traffic into this country. These agencies will regain the ability they have lacked for so long to more directly assist the Bahamian Government put an end to the transshipment of massive quantities of drugs from Latin America through its borders. We are all too cognizant of the evil these drugs bring with them. The tiny nation which lies so close to our shores is simply unable to mount and maintain the type of operation necessary to effectively combat the influx of narcotics from South America, the drugs which find their way ultimately to the United States and all too often to our young people.

The Chairman went further, however, and suggested that the Mansfield Amendment had outlived its usefulness entirely and that such country-by-country exemptions to the Amendment could become cumbersome and time-consuming. He noted that:

> Today, with the flood of narcotics into our country from so many sources abroad, there may well be other situations where the Mansfield Amendment prohibits effective cooperation. Our drug enforcement agencies need the flexibility to provide appropriate assistance to foreign governments where it will serve the best interest of the United States and the host country. The Mansfield Amendment inhibits such flexibility.
>
> What I think is needed in lieu of the Mansfield Amendment is establishing by legislation what has actually been U.S. drug enforcement cooperation policy going back 50 years in foreign countries; that "U.S. drug enforcement cooperation in foreign countries is carried out pursuant to the provisions of the international conventions for the control of narcotic and psychotropic drugs and is limited to activity which is approved by the United States Ambassador and the host country government.

The Chairman promised Representative English his cooperation in seeking passage of H.R. 962 and asked that consideration be given to the overall repeal of the Mansfield Amendment.

H.R. 962 was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. In its deliberations on H.R. 1555, the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, the Foreign Affairs Committee approved an amendment to the Mansfield Amendment permitting U.S. officers and employees to be present during drug arrests abroad to the extent that the Secretary of State and the host country agree to such a procedure. The amendment passed the House and was accepted by the Senate conferees on H.R. 1555 (sec. 605, P.L. 99-83).

COMPREHENSIVE SUBSTANCE ABUSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1985

(H.R. 1242)

H.R. 1242, "Comprehensive Substance Abuse Education Act of 1985" was introduced on February 25, 1985, by Congressman Charles Bennett (D-FL) and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. The bill would authorize to be appropriated $50 million for the Secretary of Education to establish a Comprehensive Substance Abuse Education Program in grades Kindergarten through twelfth grade. The program would discuss the physiological, social, and legal consequences of substance abuse. Seven members of the Select Committee on Narcotics are cosponsors of this legislation. These are Chairman Rangel, and Congressmen Gilman, DioGuardi, Hughes, Smith, Towns, and Guarini.

FISCAL YEARS 1986 AND 1987 STATE DEPARTMENT AUTHORIZATION BILL (H.R. 2068)

In the course of the first session of the 99th Congress Chairman Rangel gave his support to the legislative initiative of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, H.R. 2068, "The Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1986 and 1987." Of particular importance he noted four provisions of the bill that would help to strengthen our international narcotics control efforts.

Section 123 of the Act would require the Secretary of State, no later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the bill, to report

to Congress on the status of proposals to improve staffing and personnel management in the Bureau of International Narcotics Matters. Such report should spell out the appropriate means by which State would seek to enhance staffing and personnel management in the Bureau of International Narcotics Matters with the aim of improving the management of our international narcotics control program.

Section 124 is designed to ensure that foreign drug traffickers do not receive a visa to enter the United States. It requires the State Department to cooperate with other U.S. law enforcement agencies, including the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) and Customs, to establish a comprehensive information system on all drug arrests of foreign nationals in the United States. The information collected would be available to U.S. consular officials so they could avoid approving visas of known drug traffickers. At present, there is no centralized system to keep track of foreign nationals who are arrested on drug charges in the United States. Section 124 also requires the State Department and DEA to establish uniform guidelines for the sharing of information on foreign drug trafficers. Both of these provisions should help to prevent the approval of visas for foreign drug traffickers who are ineligible to enter the United States under section 212(a)(23) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(23)).

Section 125 mandates the Secretary of State to increase U.S. efforts to negotiate updated extradition treaties relating to drug offenses with each major drug-producing country, particularly those in Latin America. Under the terms of a 1982 treaty, the Government of Colombia extradited four suspected drug traffickers to the United States to face drug charges. While much needs to be done in source countries to eliminate illicit production, improve narcotics laws and wipe out official corruption that impedes drug enforcement, the approval of updated extradition treaties will help to insure that drug traffickers wanted in the United States who are apprehended in foreign countries will be brought to justice.

Finally, as a result of the brutal slaying of DEA agent Enrique Camarena Salazar as well as the disappearance of other Americans in Mexico, section 126 finds that the violence by drug traffickers and other lawless elements in Mexico constitutes a danger to U.S. citizens traveling in Mexico. It directs the Secretary of State to issue a travel advisory to warn U.S. citizens of the danger of traveling in Mexico. This travel advisory is to remain in effect until those responsible for the murder of agent Camarena have been brought to trial and a verdict obtained.

After an initial lack of cooperation in the Camarena case, the Mexican Government has taken a number of steps to find the perpetrators of this terrible crime. A number of arrests have been made in connection with this case including Mexican police and a major, Mexican drug trafficker. Chairman Rangel noted that, "section 126 is an appropriate way to maintain pressure on Mexico to prosecute those responsible for the murder of Enrique Camarena and to take aggressive measures to ensure the safety of U.S. citizens traveling in that country."

The Chairman concluded his remarks in support of H.R. 2068 by noting that, "these provisions of (the bill are) steps that will en-

hance our narcotics control efforts. Much more needs to be done, but these measures are steps in the right direction." He urged his colleagues to support the provisions of H.R. 2068.

CUSTOMS FUNDING, FISCAL YEAR 1986

The Administration's fiscal year 1986 budget request for the Customs Service proposed to cut Customs personnel by 887 positions including 206 inspectors. This proposal continued a Reagan Administration trend of recommending severe cuts in the force of Customs inspectors, even though inspectors are one of our nations' front-line defenses against drug smugglers and annually account for a sizeable portion of Customs drug seizures. In 1983, the Administration proposed to cut 2,300 Customs positions, including 873 inspectors; in 1984 a cut of 2,000 positions, including 820 inspectors was requested; and for 1985 the Administration proposed to eliminate 923 Customs personnel, including 452 inspectors. Recognizing the serious impact such large cuts would have on Customs narcotics enforcement and other responsibilities, Congress rejected these cuts year after year.

In April, prior to the Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee markup of the 1986 Customs authorization bill, Chairman Rangel wrote to subcommittee chairman Sam Gibbons. In his letter, Mr. Rangel urged the subcommittee to restore all 887 Customs positions proposed for elimination. He also offered his full support for a proposal to be offered in the subcommittee markup to add 800 new Customs positions, including 500 inspectors and other enforcement personnel. The subcommittee rejected the Administration's cuts and approved the 800 additional personnel.

In June, Chairman Rangel wrote to Representative Edward Roybal, chairman of the Treasury Appropriations Subcommittee, prior to that subcommittee's markup of the Customs budget request. He urged the subcommittee to approve the personnel increase for Customs authorized by the Trade Subcommittee.

The 1986 regular appropriations bill for the Treasury Department reported from the Appropriations Committee and passed by the House restored the proposed cuts in Customs personnel and included funds for 800 new positions. In a statement on the bill, Chairman Rangel strongly supported the Appropriations Committee recommendations. The President vetoed the Treasury appropriations bill approved by Congress, but the 1986 continuing resolution restored all of the Customs positions and authorized 623 new slots.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT OF 1986 (H.R. 2965)

On July 17, 1985, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 2965, the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Act of 1986. This measure was introduced by Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman Neal Smith in July 1985 for the purpose of making appropriations to the above referenced departments and agencies for the 1986 Fiscal Year. H.R. 2965 passed by a vote of 293–136.

Chairman Rangel, in remarks in support of the bill, stated:

. . . The bill includes $353,421,000 for the Drug Enforcement Administration, approximately $7,750,000 more than the administration's budget request and $16,327,000 more than appropriated in 1985 . . . The increases recommended by the committee are to enhance DEA's efforts in the Nation's battle against illegal drug trafficking. These additional resources include $550,000 and 11 positions for the Foreign Cooperative Investigation Program . . . the DEA presence in foreign countries, particularly source countries, is essential to our efforts to attack narcotics trafficking at its source . . .

Mr. Rangel pointed out in his remarks that $4,200,000 provided in the bill allowed for 70 additional work years for DEA's State and Local Assistance Program. Mr. Rangel also stated that close cooperation between Federal, State, and Local law enforcement agencies is essential to successfully combat the steadily growing street level trafficking of drugs that is occurring throughout our Nation.

The Senate, in the first session of the 99th Congress, had passed its version of the Department of Commerce, Justice and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Act on November 1, 1985. After a conference on the bill, the House and Senate both passed the conference report on December 5, 1985 and December 6, 1985, respectively. The bill was signed by the President on December 13, 1985, as Public Law 99–180.

ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES (ADMS) BLOCK GRANT

The Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Amendments of 1984 (P.L. 98–509) reauthorized the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Services (ADMS) Block Grant through 1987. The Block Grant is the primary mechanism for Federal financial assistance to States for drug abuse treatment, rehabilitation and prevention services.

The 1984 reauthorization included a provision requiring each State to set aside 5 per cent of its total block grant award for new substance abuse services for women. In an attempt to be more equitable, it also changed the formula for allocating block grant funds among the States so that amounts appropriated in excess of $462 million (the 1984 appropriation) would be distributed on the basis of relative population and per capita income. The effect of this change was to freeze the amounts awarded to about one-half the States at 1984 levels until ADMS appropriations exceeded $490 million, while the remaining States received an "equity adjustment" totaling $28 million.

The block grant reauthorization bill was not enacted until October 19, 1984. In the early months of 1985, the Select Committee received several reports that the new 5 percent set-aside requirement for women's substance abuse services was causing disruptions in existing drug abuse services. Comments were received from the Philadelphia City Council, the New York State Division of Substance Abuse Services (DSAS) and the National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors (NASADAD). NASADAD submitted a recent survey it had conducted of State substance abuse agencies that revealed a number of frequently occurring problems created by the women's set-aside provision.

In its comments, DSAS also objected to the change in the block grant allocation formula. Under the revised formula, New York's award was frozen at the 1984 level. DSAS argued that the population/per capita income formula did not adequately reflect the relative needs of the States for drug abuse services and that it unfairly penalized New York which has the most severe drug problem in the nation.

On June 5, Chairman Rangel forwarded copies of the comments received from NASADAD, DSAS and Philadephia to Chairman Henry A. Waxman of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, which has legislative jurisdiction over the block grant. In an accompanying letter, Mr. Rangel expressed his concern about the adverse consequences the women's set-aside was apparently having on existing drug abuse services. While supporting the intent to respond to the needs of women substance abuses, he recommended that the subcommittee consider a number of changes and clarifications to alleviate problems created by the set-aside provision. Specifically, he recommended that:

—States be permitted to delay implementation of the set-aside until fiscal year 1986 so that adequate planning could occur;
—The 5 percent set-aside be calculated only on the alcohol and drug portion of a State's block grant award, not on a State's total ADMS award;
—The set-aside requirement not be cumulative from year to year;
—Set-aside funds be available to expand existing services for women (e.g., adding new slots to an existing program) as well as to start new programs and services.

With respect to the changed formula for allocating block grant funds to the States, Mr. Rangel urged the subcommittee to consider alternatives based on indicators that would more accurately measure the seriousness of drug problems and the need for drug abuse services among the States.

Finally, Mr. Rangel noted that many of the problems States and localities faced in meeting their needs for drug abuse services were due to the simple fact that not enough resources were available. For this reason, he said, he had introduced H.R. 526, the State and Local Narcotics Control Assistance Act of 1985, which included $125 million a year for fiscal years 1986 through 1990 to help States and localities expand drug abuse services. He thanked Chairman Waxman for cosponsoring the bill and urged him to hold hearings on it as soon as possible.

COAST GUARD FUNDING

On September 5, the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member joined Representatives Gerry E. Studds and Robert Davis, the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, respectively, of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Navigation, in writing to the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee to request that $300 million be included in the Defense appropriations bill to enhance Coast Guard Drug enforcement programs. Twelve other Members signed the letter including six who serve on the Select Committee. These six—Mr. Towns, Mr. Shaw, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Smith of Florida, Mr. Fascell and Mr. Scheuer—

signed the letter in their capacity either as a Select Committee member or as a member of a standing committee with important drug abuse jurisdiction.

The letter to the Appropriations Subcommittee said, "The Coast Guard has the training, the knowledge and the will to make dramatic improvements in maritime interdiction of narcotics traffic. But it does not have sufficient people and equipment to get the job done in a manner that the public expects and the national interest demands." The letter requested additional operating expenses and procurement funds to enhance drug enforcement efforts in a number of ways: to increase coverage of the four Caribbean "choke-points" through which illicit drugs are commonly transported; to increase aerial surveillance; to increase law enforcement efforts over a broader portion of the coast; to facilitate Coast Guard participation in special interdiction operations with foreign governments and other U.S. agencies; to allow the Coast Guard to make more efficient use of its resources; and to improve interdiction of rapidly moving vessels from the Bahamas. Specific amounts requested included: $15 million to increase the assignment of Coast Guard law enforcement personnel to appropriate Navy vessels (already authorized in the 1986 Defense Department authorization bill); $78 million to procure and operate four additional C–130 long range surveillance aircraft; $174 million to initiate procurement of eight Mine Sweeper/Hunter vessels capable of performing both maritime defense missions and drug law enforcement; and $33 million to procure and operate excess Navy and MARAD vessels.

The Appropriations Committee did not approve the requested funds for the Coast Guard. During floor debate on the Defense appropriations bill (H.R. 3629), however, the House approved an amendment offered by Representative Conte of Massachusetts to provide an additional $100 million to the Coast Guard for performance of its defense readiness mission.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1986 (H.R. 3424)

Chairman Rangel spoke on the House floor in support of the conference report on H.R. 3424, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1986. Specifically, he addressed those provisions in the bill which related directly to drug abuse.

The conference report provided $91.807 million for the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA). This included $74 million for research, $1.5 million for research training, and $16.307 million for operations. Reflected in the $91.807 million appropriation is $6.4 million that may be spent to confront AIDS. These figures represent an increase over the House recommended appropriations in all categories. Mr. Rangel strongly supported these increases.

Specifically, he endorsed the $74 million for research. Drug abuse research is essential to the development of effective drug treatment and prevention policies and programs, adequate funding must be provided. The national scope of the drug problem in this country requires an effective, well-coordinated research program which has both Federal leadership and financial support. In addition threat of

AIDS to the American people demands that NIDA play an important role in investigating the linkages between intravenous drug use and AIDS. Mr. Rangel also supported the $1.5 million for research training, because maintaining an adequate number of skilled drug abuse researchers is critical to high quality drug research efforts. Finally he endorsed the increase in direct operations which was $1 million more than the 1985 appropriation and included approximately $1.8 million for AIDS-related activities.

Mr. Rangel did, however, express concern about the level of funding for the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health block grant. The conference report, as did the House bill, provided only $490 million. This was the same amount allotted in 1985. According to Mr. Rangel this amount was not sufficient, because the block grant is the primary source of Federal funding to States to support community-based drug abuse treatment and prevention programs as well as alcohol abuse and mental health services.

Finally, Mr. Rangel indicated his continued reservations about the Department of Education's role in drug abuse education, as the Department allocates only $3 million of its more than $18 billion budget for drug abuse education. The Department's school-based drug abuse prevention efforts through the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program are simply inadequate to meet the epidemic of drug abuse among the school age population.

REIMBURSEMENT TO STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES FOR COSTS INCURRED IN THEIR CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS WHICH CONTRIBUTE TO THE EVENTUAL RECOVERY OF FEDERAL TAXES (H.R. 3136)

The Select Committee has been concerned about the lack of financial resources and incentives for State and local law enforcement agencies to combat narcotics-related organized criminal activity. H.R. 3136, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for reimbursement to State and local law enforcement agencies for costs incurred in investigation which substantially contribute to the eventual recovery of Federal taxes, responds to this concern.

H.R. 3136 was introduced by Mr. Sam Gibbons. Chairman Rangel and other Members of the Select Committee joined Mr. Gibbons as cosponsors.

Specifically, the bill provides for the reimbursement to State and local law enforcement agencies for costs incurred in their criminal investigations which contribute to the eventual recovery of Federal taxes. The amount of reimbursement allowed would not exceed ten percent of the total sum ultimately recovered by the IRS. Moreover, reimbursement of investigative expenses will not reduce IRS recoveries, because the monies will come from revenues that would not have been forthcoming to IRS without the initial State or local law enforcement investigation.

MEDICAL USE OF HEROIN

In the 98th Congress, the House of Representatives decisively defeated legislation to make injectable heroin legally available to treat intractable pain in terminally ill cancer patients. The vote

against this bill, which occurred after lengthy and thorough debate, was 355–55.

Chairman Rangel, Ranking Minority Member Gilman and several other members of the Select Committee participated actively in the debate on this bill, urging the House to reject it. The major arguments against the bill were: the lack of any scientific evidence to indicate heroin's superiority in treating cancer pain; the availability of Dilaudid-HP which works faster and longer than heroin and is twice as potent; the overwhelming opposition of U.S. health and medical professionals to legalizing heroin; and the additional security risks that legal heroin distribution would present.

Similar legislation authorizing the medical use of heroin was reintroduced in the Senate in the first days of the 99th Congress (S. 70) and a few months later in the House (H.R. 1597). During this same period of time, the Canadian Government announced plans to make heroin available on a limited basis for treatment of cancer pain.

Throughout 1985, Chairman Rangel continued his strong advocacy against any move to make heroin legally available for medical use in the United States. In January, he wrote to both the Washington Post and the New York Times, responding to editorials in those papers that called for Congress to enact legislation to permit heroin's medical use. Rejecting their suggestion that politics and insensitivity to the pain of cancer victims motivated the 1984 preelection defeat of the heroin bill in the House, Mr. Rangel said both editorials failed to recognize the legitimate concerns that opponents of this legislation expressed. He said prolonging the debate over legalization of heroin would only continue to deflect attention away from what is really needed to better control chronic pain—more and better training of physicians and other medical personnel in the proper use of available medications and new techniques to alleviate pain.

When the Post ran another similar editorial in November, Mr. Rangel again replied. He said the editorial was nothing more than a rehash of previous editorials on the subject, all of which ignored the genuine controversy surrounding the issue of compassionate pain relief. He again restated the sound arguments against legalizing heroin for medical use.

With regard to the Canadian decision to make heroin available for cancer patients, Mr. Rangel wrote Health and Human Services Secretary Margaret M. Heckler in mid-January. Noting her leadership in opposing the heroin legislation in the House, he urged her to take the lead in coordinating a U.S. position for presentation to the Canadian Government that would reflect fully the United States' serious concerns with the Canadian action and request Canada to reconsider its decision. In March, Mr. Rangel wrote to President Reagan prior to the President's meeting with Canadian Prime Minister Mulroney. He urged the President to convey to the Prime Minister the strong U.S. objections to the medical use of heroin and to urge the Canadian Government to reconsider its decision. In a reply from the White House, the Chairman was informed that his concerns had been conveyed to the President and other Administration officials. In subsequent correspondence, the Chairman was advised that the U.S. views on this issue had been made

known to the Canadian Government, and that U.S. officials would continue to express our objections to the legalization of heroin for medical use.

Notwithstanding U.S. objections, the Canadian Government went forward with its plan. Various reports have indicated widespread opposition to the plan among Canadian pharmacists and hospitals. The Committee understands that there has been very little demand for heroin by Canadian physicians and that hospitals are refusing to stock it.

Special Activities

GULF STATE GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE ON DRUG TRAFFICKING, NEW ORLEANS (JANUARY 17)

On January 17, 1985, Chairman Rangel and Mr. Guarini participated in a conference of the Gulf Coast Governors on drug trafficking through their States. The conference was called for by Texas Governor Mark White and was attended by Governors George C. Wallace of Alabama, Bob Graham of Florida, Edwin Edwards of Louisiana, and William Allain of Mississippi. In addition, representatives of Governor Joe Frank Harris of Georgia were in attendance.

This conference was convened to demonstrate the growing concerns of the Gulf Coast Governors over the increasing amount of drug trafficking taking place in and through their states from South America and the Caribbean. Each the Governors told of increasing drug smuggling investigations and cases being handled by their state police and investigative agencies. They all expressed frustration that, notwithstanding increased Federal interdiction efforts in the southeast, their states are being inundated by drug trafficking.

At the conference both Mr. Rangel and Mr. Guarini concurred in the sentiments expressed by the Governors. The Chairman pointed out to the Governors that the root cause of the problems faced by their states were inadequate international narcotics control policies being conducted by our State Department in Latin America. Mr. Rangel asserted that neither the President nor the Secretary of State had raised narcotics control to a sufficiently high point on our nation's foreign policy agenda. He called on the State Department to begin effective dialogues with drug producing nations with a view toward developing comprehensive plans that would significantly reduce the cultivation and production of illegal drugs.

Mr. Guarini called upon the Federal Government to become a better partner with State and local law enforcement agencies in combatting drug trafficking and drug-related crimes. He called the lack of Federal assistance to the states in this area appalling, and urged the Gulf Governors to give their full support to H.R. 526, the State and Local Narcotics Control Assistance Act that had been recently introduced by members of the Select Committee. H.R. 526 would authorize $750 million a year for the next five fiscal years to assist State and local governments in drug abuse law enforcement and treatment and prevention activities.

The Conference concluded with the passage of three resolutions by the Governors calling for the following actions by the Administration and the Congress to achieve more effective narcotics control. The recommendations, which Mr. Rangel and Mr. Guarini agreed to bring back to the Congress, were:

1. That the President and all Federal agencies develop a defense strategy against narcotics smuggling and to obtain whatever military resources are necessary to control the illegal trafficking of narcotics into the United States;
2. That the Congress pass legislation which would assign the the Department of Defense the specific mission of actively searching for the interdicting agents attempting to smuggle narcotics into our country;
3. That funding and manpower for the federal drug enforcement agencies be increased to combat the flow of illicit drugs into the United States.

CHAIRMAN'S ADDRESS TO THE U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS, HUMAN DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (JANUARY 18)

On January 18, 1985, Chairman Rangel addressed the Human Resources Committee of the U.S. Conference of Mayors on the impact of drug abuse and drug trafficking on our Nation's cities. In his remarks he noted that State and local governments are being overwhelmed by drug trafficking and drug abuse and their related costs. Yet, these units of government have been left to cope with these rising problems while the resources available to do the job have been diminishing.

Mr. Rangel called upon the U.S. Conference of Mayors to take a strong leadership role in urging the Federal Government to come to the assistance of State and local governments who are bearing the large responsibility of responding to drug abuse in America. He specifically urged the Mayors to endorse legislation introduced by members of the Select Committee, H.R. 526, the "State and Local Narcotics Control Assistance Act". This bill would authorize $750 million a year for the next five fiscal years to assist State and local governments increase their efforts to control drug abuse and drug trafficking.

SPONSORSHIP OF SHOWING JACQUES COUSTEAU'S DOCUMENTARY, "SNOWSTORM IN THE JUNGLE" (FEBRUARY 25)

On February 25, 1985, the Select Committee along with the Senate Drug Enforcement Caucus, co-chaired by Senators Paula Hawkins and Dennis DeConcini, invited Members of the House and Senate to a private viewing of the documentary, "Snowstorm in the Jungle". This one-hour film explored illegal drug production, trafficking and abuse in the Andes (i.e. Colombia, Bolivia and Peru), from small coca bush farmers who flatly stated that they knew and hoped that their crop would subvert U.S. values and influence in the world to a clinic which treats drug addiction with surgery—a partial lobotomy.

Mr. Jean-Michel Cousteau who co-produced this documentary with his father, Jacques Cousteau, introduced the film and answered questions following its screening.

RECEPTION FOR PEGGY MANN, AUTHOR OF "MARIJUANA ALERT" (FEBRUARY 26)

On February 26, 1985, Select Committee Chairman Rangel and Senate Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Chairman Paula Hawkins co-hosted a reception honoring Mrs. Peggy Mann on the publication of her new book, "Marijuana Alert." Mrs. Mann has been a prolific writer on the dangers of drug abuse and an ardent advocate of drug abuse education and prevention efforts. "Marijuana Alert" is especially important because it dispells the fairly widely held myth that marijuana is a harmless substance.

ADDRESS TO THE NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF STATE DRUG ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES (MAY 6)

The National Alliance of State Drug Enforcement Agencies (NASDEA) invited Chairman Rangel to address its spring conference held on May 6, 1985. The invitation was an outgrowth of the South Florida Law Enforcement Conference held by the Select Committee in May 1984. It had generated much interest on the part of law inforcement officers in the Select Committee's legislative initiatives to assist drug law enforcement, in particular H.R. 526, "the State and Local Narcotics Control Assistance Act."

Due to the conflict of legislative business, Chairman Rangel requested that Chief of Staff John T. Cusack represent him at the conference. Mr. Cusack outlined for NASDEA members the Select Committee's findings from its domestic hearings and the international study missions held during the previous two years.

In spite of its belief that the elimination of narcotic crops at their source is crucial to solving the drug problem, the Committee determined that this is not a realistic expectation for the near future. From information gathered during its study missions, it estimated that if a serious commitment to illicit narcotics crop eradication were immediately initiated in every narcotics producing country, it would still be another five years before a meaningful reduction in the narcotics supply would be evident.

In the meantime, Select Committee hearings had shown that Federal, State and local narcotics enforcement officers all across the nation are being overwhelmed by the ever-increasing volume of narcotics being smuggled into our country. Mr. Cusack explained that, while committed to solving this problem at its root, i.e. stopping production, H.R. 526 is an attempt to deal with the immediate and very serious problem of the heavy drug traffic caused by the failure to eliminate drug production.

The law enforcement officials were very responsive. While Administration officials had told them that progress was being made internationally, the consensus was that it was not—the increasing quantities of all drugs available in their districts belied that assertion. Many recounted their first-hand experiences with the enormity of the problem in their districts and told of their frustration in their inability to cope with it, due to a severe lack of resources. They were very enthusiastic about this legislative initiative and encouraged the Committee and the Congress to push for its passage as soon as possible.

HEARING BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISCAL AFFAIRS, ON DRUG ABUSE AND DRUG TRAFFICKING IN WASHINGTON, D.C. (APRIL 17)

On April 17, 1985, the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs and Health of the Committee on the District of Columbia held hearings to examine the scope and pattern of interstate drug trafficking in the Washington Metropolitan Area of Virginia, Maryland and the District of Columbia. Emphasis was placed on interstate drug trafficking laws and the way these laws operate in the practical setting of the District of Columbia as impacted by traffic to and from Virginia and Maryland.

Federal and local law enforcement officials were called as witnesses:

Panel—Chiefs of Police:

John Granfield, Fairfax County, VA;
Maj. Virgil Hottinger, Montgomery County, MD;
Maj. James Ross, Prince George's County, MD; and
Chief of Police Maurice Turner, District of Columbia.

Panel—Department of the Interior, U.S. Park Police, Narcotics Division:

Deputy Chief, James Lindsay;
Maj. William McQueeney; and
Joseph DiGenova, U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia accompanied by Norman Zigrossi (FBI), Carl Jackson (DEA) and Sidney Reyes (Customs).

Hon. Walter E. Fauntroy, Chairman of the Subcommittee presided. Subcommittee Members present were Representatives Barnes, Dymally and Parris. Present from the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control were Chairman Charles B. Rangel and Ranking Minority Member Benjamin A. Gilman.

Chief Granfield of Fairfax County stated that the chief drug problem in Northern Virginia is marijuana. He noted that about 67 percent of the arrests Fairfax County has made for drug violations deal with marijuana. He stated also that 17 percent of the County's narcotics-related arrests are for cocaine and 16 percent are for PCP which is reportedly manufactured in rural areas of Northern Virginia.

Granfield went on to say that Fairfax County's Vice and Narcotics Section is composed of 16 officers of which 12 are dedicated full-time to narcotics enforcement. Three of these (officers) however, are detailed to a regional task force leaving just 9 to the 410 square mile county that has a population of some 700,000 people.

Major Hottinger of Montgomery County, Maryland noted that one of the problems of working with the Federal agencies, DEA in particular, is that the rules and regulations by which they operate are too inflexible. He noted that Federal priorities are different and they are too often controlled by weight guidelines and minimums which dictate whether or not they will enter a particular case. Montgomery County, he noted, has a population of approximately 690,000 with nine narcotics officers and two others in a pharmaceutical section.

Major James Ross of Prince George's County stated that the majority of drug related investigations undertaken by the County's

police force have centered upon PCP and cocaine both of which are more widely available in the County than ever before. The Vice Control Section of the P.G. County police force has a total of 21 officers, 10 of which are dedicated full-time to the narcotic enforcement effort in a county of 486 square miles with a population of over 700,000 people. Ross also noted this lack of personnel is compounded by the fact that state laboratories are so overburdened that they cannot give (the County police) timely examination and the turnaround time that (the police) need for preparation of cases.

The District's Chief of Police Maurice Turner noted that while marijuana is the most abused drug in Washington, arrests for violations involving cocaine have increased 90 percent from 1982. Street sales of PCP have greatly escalated as well making the District the "PCP Capital of the World" while heroin purity increases and prices decrease. Today there are some 15,000 heroin addicts in Washington.

A total of 281 District police officers are devoted full-time to narcotics enforcement of a total force of 3,800 officers. Chemical analysis is handled by the Drug Enforcement Administration's laboratory here in the District. Turner noted sentences for drug violators are generally stiffer in the Federal Courts in Maryland and Virginia than in the Federal Court for the District of Columbia.

United States Attorney Joseph DiGenova said that the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) had referred 24,861 cases to the U.S. Attorney in 1984. This was up 22 percent from the 19,339 adult arrests referred in 1979. Further he said, 31 percent of the 1984 figure were felony arrests which resulted in 1,985 drug felony indictments. DiGenova indicated there is a need for more prosecutors and Judges in the Federal System.

INTERPOL, 57TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY, RECEPTION (OCTOBER 2)

The International Criminal Police Organization, INTERPOL, was created to allow direct communication and cooperation between member countries' law enforcement agencies on criminal investigations. Prior to its formation in 1923, law enforcement officials had to go through various diplomatic channels to communicate with their foreign counterparts. This was hopelessly ineffective, but the INTERPOL concept dramatically improved police communication and cooperation among the 136 member nations. Narcotics cooperation has traditionally been one of the major elements of this cooperation.

INTERPOL was invited by the U.S. Government to hold its 54th Annual General Assembly in Washington, D.C., during October 1985. Select Committee Chairman Rangel invited Judiciary Committee Chairman Peter W. Rodino, Jr., and Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Dante B. Fascell to join him in co-hosting a reception for the delegates to the INTERPOL General Assembly. On October 2, 1985, Members of all three Committees participated in welcoming law enforcement representatives from the 136 member nations and commending them on their important work.

CONGRESSMAN AKAKA'S SPEECH TO HAWAIIAN LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS (AUGUST 30)

On August 30, 1985, Mr. Akaka addressed the Hawaii State Law Enforcement Officials Association on the issue of domestic marijuana eradication. In his remarks he noted that while the Department of Justice has launched a national marijuana eradication effort—known as Operation Delta-9—earlier that month, an effective, long term domestic marijuana eradication will require an effective working relationship between Federal, state and local law enforcement officials. Mr. Akaka called for more Federal assistance to the States in carrying on eradication projects.

CONGRESSIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON DRUG TRAFFICKING AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE

The Congressional Advisory Committee on Drug Trafficking and Substance Abuse, which consists of parents, students, teachers, health professionals, guidance counselors, clergy, law enforcement officers, treatment and rehabilitation specialists, school administrators, and business and labor leaders in New York's 22nd Congressional District, was created in the summer of 1981 to help raise the consciousness of the public regarding the dangers of drug abuse. The Drug Advisory Committee sponsors seminars and workshops, provides information to community leaders, is a forum for community groups to meet to exchange information and helps community leaders act upon their local drug problems. The Advisory Committee is also a liaison with the New York State Division of Substance Abuse Services, Federal drug agencies, the House Narcotics Select Committee, and local drug-related community groups. Congressman Gilman met with the Drug Advisory Committee in June and in November of 1985.

Assisted by the Narcotics Select Committee, the Drug Advisory Committee met on June 8th, 1985 at Swan Lake, New York. The program, which was designed to help community leaders become more aware of the magnitude of drug trafficking, drug abuse and drug treatment facilities, consisted of two parts. The first half of the program centered on a film entitled "Snowstorm in the Jungle" which was produced by the celebrated explorer Jacques Cousteau and his son Jean-Michel and the Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. The film vividly depicts cocaine trafficking in the Amazon region of South America and shows the shocking manner in which some drug addicts are treated in that part of the world, including lobotomy operations that attempt to deaden the addict's desire for narcotics. The second portion of the program was devoted to discussing the drug treatment program at Daytop Village, which under the leadership of Monsignor William O'Brien, President of Daytop Village, Inc., has become a major drug treatment facility in the United States and in Italy. Following the viewing of the film "Snowstorm in the Jungle", and discussions with the drug counselors and residents at Daytop Village, the Drug Advisory group heard reports from community leaders regarding their drug related activities.

Through the cooperation of Dr. Mitchell Rosenthal, President of Phoenix House Foundation, Inc., the Drug Advisory group met on

November 16, 1985 at the Phoenix House Yorktown Drug Rehabilitation Facility in Shrub Oak, New York. Phoenix House, which has several major drug rehabilitation facilities in New York and California, is a major drug rehabilitation center in the United States and is a leader in the drug treatment field. The visits to Daytop Village and Phoenix House provided members of the Congressional Drug Advisory Committee with the opportunity to learn at first hand how two major drug treatment organizations successfully treat drug dependent individuals, especially youngsters, and to better understand the dynamics of drug addiction.

SENATE DRUG ENFORCEMENT CAUCUS HEARING ON THE COST OF DRUG ABUSE TREATMENT AND PREVENTION TO YOUTH (AUGUST 20)

On August 20, 1985, Rep. Benjamin Gilman, Ranking Minority Member of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, joined Sen. Alfonse D'Amato (NY) of the Senate Drug Enforcement Caucus in a hearing at the Westchester County Ceremonial Courtroom in White Plains, N.Y., to review the cost of drug abuse treatment and prevention efforts for youth.

The severity of the drug abuse problem is underscored when one first takes into account that together with the Hudson Valley region (just north of New York City), and Nassau and Suffolk counties on Long Island, the New York City area has approximately 65% of the State's population but 90% of the State's narcotics abusers.

I. Local Government Panel

Four panels presented testimony and answered questions during the hearing. The first panel, expressing local government concerns, was represented by Andrew O'Rourke, County Executive for Westchester County. County Executive O'Rourke's testimony focused on the work he has done to tackle the drug trafficking and abuse problem in Westchester County since he took office several years ago. He noted that Westchester County was the first to adopt anti-head shop legislation, which he introduced while still a county legislator. Furthermore, since his tenure as County Executive, the narcotics squad has been enlarged by almost 50%, a drug detoxification program for newly arrested addicts was instituted, and a county wide student assistance prevention program was adopted by the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) as a national model.

The drug abuse problem in Westchester County is of serious proportions. The highest levels of marijuana use are in the Hudson Valley region, of which Westchester County accounts for nearly half the population. A recent New York State Division of Substance Abuse Services survey also disclosed that of 7-12th grade high school students in Westchester County, 12% frequently use marijuana, 2% cocaine, 18% beer, and 7% distilled spirits. These alarming statistics warrant ongoing and in depth action in response to this ever growing threat, and of a total county budget of $600 million, approximately $35 million are allocated to drug related activities.

County Executive O'Rourke cited further that estimates and projections of drug abusers for the Hudson Valley Region (Region 6)

through 1988 is expected to continue to rise; it is therefore crucial that Congress adopt H.R. 526, sponsored by Chairman Rangel and Congressman Gilman. This measure, the State and Local Narcotics Control Assistance Act, would authorize $750 million annually in FYs 1986–90 to assist States and localities in their efforts to control drug abuse and drug trafficking. Funds would be used to provide for increased enforcement, prosecution, relief to overburdened courts, prison facilities, domestic eradication, and treatment, prevention, and rehabilitation services.

Mr. O'Rourke also expressed support for legislation recently introduced by Senator D'Amato. The Comprehensive Drug Law Enforcement, Prevention and Treatment Act, S. 1583, would expand the current drug forfeiture program to include use of funds for additional law enforcement purposes, as well as treatment and prevention programs.

County Executive O'Rourke, while proud of the dedication and hard work exhibited by enforcement, treatment and prevention professionals in Westchester County, expressed great willingness to continue to work with State and Federal officials in a combined effort to deal with this three pronged problem in Westchester, and particularly urged at the end of his presentation that additional Federal funds be forthcoming in future fiscal years.

II. Treatment Panel—Phoenix House

The second and third panels represented the treatment spectrum, beginning with Dr. Mitchell Rosenthal, President of Phoenix House Foundation in New York. Dr. Rosenthal was accompanied by two young, recovering substance abusers in their late teens, John and Tom.

Dr. Rosenthal briefly outlined the scope of Phoenix House's activities, as well as the depth of approach. He then turned to a discussion of what is, in his opinion, the core problem facing American society today regarding the nature of drug abuse. Dr. Rosenthal senses an unwillingness on the part of the American public to define precisely what constitutes drug abuse. Thus, the demand side of the problem fails to get the attention it so desperately needs due to American public perception of marijuana and cocaine as "recreational drugs," thereby denying "drug addict" status to this type of user. Accordingly, public attitudes need to change markedly if the prevention aspect is to be at all successful. Although Dr. Rosenthal senses a slight change in public awarness, he maintains that preventive education efforts should be mandatory in elementary schools, and that mandatory training of teachers should take place as well. Dr. Rosenthal further cited the long waiting list of individuals desiring treatment in New York State as clear evidence that additional treatment facilities are warranted.

John and Tom, both enrolled at Phoenix House facilities, spoke to the Committee about their personal experiences with drugs. Each had grown up in the New York suburban area, and answered questions with frankness and clarity.

John, now age 20, began abusing alcohol at 15. He progressed to using pills and by age 16 was abusing PCP, cocaine and heroin. At this time he also dropped out of school. By age 17 he was drinking every day and now robbed from friends and his grandparents in

order to support his habit. To this end he stole a car at age 19, for which he was arrested and charged on 15 counts. John also spent ten days on Rikers Island at the men's correctional facility. Though John wanted treatment and counseling to combat his addiction, and had considered suicide, he did not know to whom he could turn. He asked his grandparents to intervene, and after making several inquiries about treatment, John's grandparents learned of Phoenix House. John has been in the Phoenix House/JFK High School program for nine months and has discovered a new outlook on life. He now looks forward to going to college, and greatly appreciates the emphasis on honesty at Phoneix House, feeling that the seminars and group encounters are of great benefit.

Tom, age 19, began indulging in marijuana at age 12 in order to gain acceptance from his peers. As he grew older, his list of abused substances came to include valium, alcohol, LSD, cocaine and qualudes. At the age of 18 he was dismissed from high school. Tom has been enrolled in the after school program at Phoenix House for five months, and will graduate from high school in the Fall. He too, plans to attend college in the near future, and acknowledges the help and guidance he has received from the staff at Phoenix House since his joining them. Both young men agreed that early prevention efforts in their schools would have given them a better indication about the dangers of drug abuse and addiction, and that this information needs to be disseminated on a wider basis.

III. Treatment Panel—Daytop Village

The third panel was headed by Monsignor William O'Brien, President of Daytop Village. He was accompanied by three teenagers currently undergoing rehabilitative treatment at Daytop Village's facilities. The adolescents, Bill, Nicki, and Ann, addressed the Members following Monsignor O'Brien's remarks.

Monsignor O'Brien briefly outlined Daytop's approach, which concentrates on family involvement in the entire healing process. He noted that today's adolescent addicts are growing increasingly younger since the problem of drug abuse continues to persist and the Woodstock generation's children reach their teen years.

Prevention and treatment efforts need to be redoubled, according to Monsignor O'Brien, if we are to effectively cope with the tragedy in our midst. Monsignor O'Brien revealed that Daytop Village, with its 90% success rate, had a waiting list at the present time of approximately 250 individuals. Moreover, he added, almost 1,200 men and women were waiting for treatment throughout New York State. But a major barrier society needs to overcome is the wall of silence and secrecy protecting family pride. Monsignor O'Brien stressed the necessity of extricating ourselves from the "what" of the program, and in expanding the "why," thereby dealing with the pain of the adolescent abuser.

Following Monsignor O'Brien's introduction of the three teenage panelists, each outlined his or her history of drug use. Bill informed the members that following his parent's divorce when he was thirteen years old, he tried to dissuade both his mother and sister from using illicit substances, but to no avail. He then began experimenting himself, and was soon abusing marijuana, alcohol, LSD and cocaine. While a boarding student at a college preparato-

ry high school he continued this abuse, apparently supplied by others at no cost to himself. He was, however, suspended twice and arrested twice. It was at this juncture that his father removed him from school and enrolled him in Daytop Village.

Ann and Nicki both began using illicit substances at age 12 out of curiosity. Nicki added that for her, drugs were a means of escape, while Ann felt that her own rebellious attitude also contributed significantly. Ann's use of alochol and marijuana helped her gain acceptance with her peers, and getting high helped her to cope with uncomfortable situations. In her early teens, Ann recounted, she joined her alcoholic father when he drank, and by the 9th grade Ann was high every day, now adding unruly behavior to her everyday existence. Ann did, however, seek counseling and assistance on her own, and told her parents she was joining Daytop Village.

When asked whether or not prevention efforts in the classroom would have helped, Bill responded that such education would be beneficial for younger students who had not yet been exposed to the drug culture, but not for someone who was already getting high. Ann felt that she would have taken drugs irrespective of preventive education, due to her rebellious nature, curiosity, and the challenge involved.

IV. Prevention Panel

The last Panel was composed of prevention professionals in community and school-based programs. This panel consisted of Dr. Arnold Washton, Director of the Recovery Center at Stony Lodge Hospital in Ossining, New York and Research Director of the National Cocaine Hotline (1-800-COCAINE); George Doering, Jr., Director of Ramapo Youth Counseling Services in Rockland County, and President, New York State Association of Drug and Alcohol Abuse Prevention Professionals; Ms. Arlene Stoffel and Sister Marianne Watts, coordinators, respectively, for Northern and Southern Westchester County, New York Archdiocese Substance Abuse Ministry (D.A.R.E.); Robert Petrillo, coordinator at the Greenburgh Drug Abuse Prevention Council; Ellen Morehouse, Director, Westchester County Student Assistance Program; and Sally Shields, Director, New York Archdiocese Student Assistance Program.

Dr. Washton's experience with cocaine use and addiction extended to the compilation and analysis of several surveys which he presented to the Members. Dr. Washton echoed the sentiments of the previous speakers in acknowledging that cocaine has the erroneous image of a harmless and non-addictive substance, when, it is, in his words, "the nation's fastest growing problem". Furthermore, added Dr. Washton, cocaine is more addictive than heroin, and adolescents become addicted to cocaine more rapidly than do adults.

Included in the statistics presented by Dr. Washton were a 1983 New York State School Survey, and a 1984-85 random sample survey taken at the Cocaine Hotline. In the former, of 7-12th grade students surveyed, 14% had tried cocaine once, 10% had used it within six months, 6% had tried cocaine within one month, and 1% had abused cocaine at least ten times. Noting that since the 1983 school survey the price of cocaine has dropped to $60-70 gram while its purity has risen from 28% in 1982 to 40% in 1984, Dr.

Washton also presented the findings of his recent survey at the Cocaine Hotline. In the two years of its operation, the Hotline has received 1.2 million calls—1,200 per day. The Hotline staff have observed that the percentage of adolescent callers has increased dramatically during this time-from 1% in 1983 to 7% at present. Outlined below are the results of that survey:

Hotline Survey—Adolescent cocaine users

[Sample size-200]

	Percent
Demographics:	
Males	59
Females	41
Whites	62
Black/Hispanic	38
Average (years)	15.5
Family income over $25,000	24
Other drug use:	
Alcohol	89
Marijuana	97
Tranquilizers	66
Heroin	5
Health problems:	
Brain seizure	21
Suicide attempt	17
Memory problems	66
Depression	95
Irritability	88
Weight loss	76
Nasal sores	69
Cocaine use:	
Consumption (grams per week)	1.9
Average cost (per week)	$150
Intranasal	79
Freebase	18
Intravenous	3
School problems:	
Absenteeism	79
Lower grades	71
"High" at school	59
Disruptive	51
Expelled	33
Social problems:	
Drug dealing	48
Stealing	39
Auto accident	17
Family fights	89
Addiction:	
Can't refuse cocaine	88
Cravings and urges	94
Unable to stop use	92

Dr. Washton's recommendations for action ranged from an intensive media campaign of public education, mandatory drug testing of DWI's, drug testing in schools, to additional emphasis on school based prevention programs.

George Doering of the Ramapo Counseling Center in Rockland County pointed out the need for more trained prevention counselors as well as residential chemical dependency increased, and an extensive prevention effort must be aimed at children in grades 4–6.

Arlene Stoffel and Sister Marianne Watts, affiliated with D.A.R.E., a community based action program, echoed the need to increase public awareness in general while specifically increasing

parent awareness. Ms. Stoffel indicated that all youth could be more involved in volunteer activities, while parent support groups should be maintained by the community. Sister Marianne recommended additional outreach to PTA groups, churches and synagogues, in order to emphasize the problem to parents and encourage them to "really talk with and listen to" their children.

Robert Petrillo, Coordinator for the Greenburgh Drug Abuse Prevention Council, urged those researching the effects of marijuana to arrive at concrete conclusions about this entry drug. Citing widespread public misunderstanding of its negative qualities, he stated the need to "complete the story." In looking at the demand side of drug abuse, Mr. Petrillo recommended the creation of a national leadership training center for youth, in order to expand the peer co-counseling aspect of drug abuse prevention and at the same time provide an employment feature to the problem.

Ellen Morehouse, Director of Westchester's Student Assistance Program called for restoration of programmatic funding at all levels. Ms. Morehouse also advocated the development of programs for children of abusers, additional emphasis on development of "coping skills" for adolescents, the enforcement of existing laws such as the sale of alcohol to those over eighteen, and providing equal time for health messages on television and radio.

This comprehensive approach was followed up by the last speaker on the panel. Sally Shields, Director of the New York Archdiocese Student Assistance Program, suggested that a unified "Office of Prevention" would offer many new opportunities at combatting drug abuse. Citing the need for primary prevention and intervention, Ms. Shields echoed some of the previous panelists in calling for prevention efforts in grades 5–8. Additional efforts need to be made in creating an atmosphere of positive peer pressure among students, and in targeting children in transition, e.g., divorce or relocation.

Congressman Gilman and Senator D'Amato thanked all the panelists for their analyses and recommendations, and assured those present that their views would weigh heavily in the formulation of legislation before both houses of Congress.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Findings

1. Though the New York City area has approximately 65% of the State's population, it carries the burden of 90% of the drug abuse problem.

2. The highest levels of marijuana use in the New York City region are in the Hudson Valley area, of which Westchester County, a suburban and relatively affluent county, accounts for nearly half the population.

3. New York State Division of Substance Abuse Services projections for the next several years indicate that the drug abuse problem in Westchester County will continue to rise.

4. Professional assessments of American public opinion reveal the belief that marijuana and cocaine are considered "recreational drugs" whose users are not thought of as addicts.

5. Adolescent abusers are growing younger each year; the problem is exacerbated when finding #4 is factored in.

6. Substantial numbers of individuals continue to wait for openings in treatment programs. In New York State alone, the waiting list approaches 1,200 men, women and children.

7. Cocaine is considered by some prevention professionals to be more addictive than heroin. Furthermore, they state, adolescents become addicted to cocaine more rapidly than adults.

8. The percentage of adolescent callers to the Cocaine Hotline has increased dramatically—from 1% of their calls in 1983 to 7% in 1985.

B. Recommendations

1. Local government officials suggested the Federal adoption of anti-head shop legislation, increasing the school-based prevention effort, and in establishing additional treatment centers for young substance abusers. Support was also expressed for H.R. 526 and S. 1583, and emphasis was placed on increasing Federal funds for drug law enforcement, treatment and prevention efforts.

2. Several of the panelists recommended instituting mandatory preventive education programs in the schools, with particular attention being given to elementary school students. The Members were also urged to consider mandatory teacher training.

3. Because almost all the speakers expressed the opinion that the American public and especially parents, need to understand that marijuana and cocaine are not recreational drugs, it was strongly urged that a national, intensive, media effort be undertaken. In conjuction with this, school based prevention programs should be expanded, outreach efforts to parent-teacher groups should be redoubled, and additional community action should be undertaken and aimed at parents.

4. All of the witnesses stated the need for additional funding in order to carry out programmatic objectives. Special attention was given to those currently waiting for treatment who are unable to begin therapy due to lack of funds.

5. Other solutions and recommendations offered by one or two witnesses are listed below. They are listed en bloc only because these concepts were not echoed by a majority of the panelists:

a. Drug testing in schools.

b. Mandatory drug testing of DWI's.

c. Increasing adolescent involvement in volunteer activities.

d. Creation of a National Leadership Training Center for Youth. This center would train teenage peer counselors in the drug abuse prevention field.

e. Creation of a unified Office of Prevention.

f. Enforcement of existing laws, e.g. the sale of alcoholic beverages to those over eighteen.

g. Providing equal time for health messages on television and radio regarding alcohol and related substances.

REPRESENTATIVE GILMAN TESTIFIES ON NEW YORK STATE DRUG PLAN (SEPTEMBER 13)

On September 13, 1985, Representative Gilman testified in support of the New York State's Comprehensive Five-Year Drug Plan at a hearing held by the State's Division of Substance Abuse Services in New York City. The Division's comprehensive drug plan would create four pilot vocational projects to enhance the employability of youthful substance abusers in treatment programs. The plan also calls for a treatment program for adolescent drug abusers, a community-based training project on substance abuse detection and prevention, and a task force to study the children of substance abusers.

MEMBERS' DISTRICT ACTIVITIES

Members of the Select Committee are actively involved in the drug problem, both inside and outside the hearing room. Some of the recent activities of Select Committee members during 1985 include the following.

Ranking Minority Member Benjamin Gilman (NY) held regular meetings with his Congressional Drug Advisory Committee, which is involved in such activities as visiting the Daytop Village and Phoenix House Foundation facilities.

Pete Stark held meetings with U.S. Customs personnel in an effort to improve narcotics interdiction at Oakland airport.

Frank Guarini of New Jersey devoted nearly an entire summer newsletter to the serious problem of drug-related crime and abuse in the New Jersey area.

Cardiss Collins hosted a cable-TV program in her district to discuss the growing problem of drug abuse and trafficking in the Chicago area.

Doris Matsui, wife of Bob Matsui of Sacramento, is an active member of the California chapter of Parents for Drug Free Youth as well as the Congressional Families for Drug Free Youth. She taped a public service announcement on drug abuse prevention for airing in the 3rd District.

D.C. Delegate Walter Fauntroy hosted a mid-November Town Meeting on "Drugs—A High To Avoid," featuring presentations by the Howard University Drug Abuse Center, NIDA and RAP Inc. He also issued a fall newsletter that prominently discussed drug abuse prevention efforts.

Larry Coughlin of Pennsylvania held a Community Forum in September where former Minnesota Viking Carl Eller and Norton Wilder, special DEA agent for the Philadelphia office, urged additional prevention, treatment and enforcement efforts.

In memory of slain DEA agent Enrique Camarena, Duncan Hunter of California is developing "Camarena Clubs" in his district to educate students and their communities about the perils of drug abuse. The first chapter created in the fall at Camarena's alma mater, Calexico High School, boasts 200 charter members. Hunter also sponsored a March seminar that brought together the public and federal agencies involved in drug enforcement.

Solomon Ortiz of Texas spoke to a large audience of the United Methodist Youth Foundation, urging involvement in the Drugbusters Awareness program operated in conjunction with local police.

In an effort to solve jurisdicational problems regarding aircraft suspected of smuggling drugs into the United States at Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport, E. Clay Shaw arranged an October meeting between the city attorney and police with representatives of the Federal Aviation Administration, DEA, and the Aviation Subcommittee of the Public Works and Transportation Committee. Local officers have been unable to act against suspected drug smugglers due to specific jurisdiction accorded the FAA.

Michael Strang (Colo.) has provided the more than 50 weekly newspapers in his district with a column on substance abuse, and toured the Rocky Mountain Substance Abuse Treatment Unit in Walsenberg, Colorado—a rural town of 4,000 recognized as needing a treatment center for chemical dependency and alcoholism.

Joseph DioGuardi is planning a series of town hall meetings for his New York constituents on drug abuse and crime.

And, owing to the growing number of opiate and cocaine addicts on treatment waiting lists in Connecticut, John Rowland met with the state's centers in October to explore possible additional funding.

Mel Levine introduced legislation to ban the sale of drug paraphernalia and is considering legislation banning nitrite inhalants. He is also planning to host town hall meetings in his district to discuss drug abuse, and will devote a newsletter to drug problems next summer.

STAFF LIAISON WITH INTERESTED GROUPS AND ORGANIZATIONS

Throughout the year, Select Committee staff participated in numerous drug-related conferences and met with a variety of groups and organizations interested in drug abuse issues. These meetings provided an opportunity for staff to present the Committee's findings as to the nature and extent of drug abuse and drug trafficking and to discuss current legislative developments relating to drug abuse and control. They also permitted staff to obtain the views and insights of drug abuse professionals, parents, scholars and others who are actively involved in the drug abuse field. The meetings and conferences covered a broad range of drug abuse concerns including international narcotics control, drug law enforcement, treatment and rehabilitation and drug abuse prevention. The following examples are representative of staff activities in this area.

On April 26, Chief of Staff John T. Cusack lectured at a conference on cocaine sponsored by the Latin American Studies Program at Cornell University. The conference was entitled, "The Coca Leaf and its Derivatives; Biology, Society and Policy." Mr. Cusack discussed coca and cocaine and the international narcotics control system.

On May 13, Mr. Cusack participated in a narcotics control symposium sponsored by the President's Commission on Organized Crime. Mr. Cusack was part of a panel discussing policy options in drug enforcement. Other panel members included John E. Ingersoll, former Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous

Drugs; Professor John Kaplan of the Harvard Law School; Professor Mark Moore from the Kennedy School of Public Administration at Harvard University; Francis M. Mullen, Jr., former Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration and Ronald K. Siegel, Ph.D., from the UCLA Medical School.

On May 20, Mr. Cusack addressed the Board of Directors of the Therapeutic Communities of America (TCA) who were meeting in Washington, D.C. Founded in 1975, TCA is the principal association of non-profit, residential drug-free treatment programs in the United States, with approximately 300 members.

On November 7, 1986, Mr. Cusack addressed the fourth national conference of the National Federation of Parents for Drug-Free Youth, meeting in Washington, D.C.

GAO REPORT ON FEDERAL DRUG ABUSE FUNDING

The Administration's 1984 National Strategy for Prevention of Drug Abuse and Drug Trafficking included tables summarizing the Federal drug abuse budget for fiscal years 1981 through 1985. The summary indicated that the Federal spending for drug law enforcement would increase from roughly $700 million in 1981 to about $1.2 billion in 1985. On the prevention and treatment side, the summary revealed a decrease in Federal funding from approximately $404 million in 1981 to $253 million in 1985.

In November 1984, Mr. Rangel and Mr. Gilman requested the General Accounting Office to audit Federal drug abuse spending for 1981–1985. The purpose of this review was to determine (1) whether Federal drug abuse expenditures reported for 1981–1985 accurately reflected what each Federal agency spent on drug/related programs; (2) the criteria Federal agencies used in reporting drug-related expenditures; (3) the real (after inflation) increase or decrease in Federal drug-related expenditures; (4) what accounted for the real increase, if any, in Federal drug law enforcement expenditures; and (5) what accounted for the decrease in Federal drug treatment and prevention expenditures.

GAO submitted its report (GAO/GGD–85–61) in June 1985. On the basis of a sample of Federal agencies with major drug abuse program responsibilities, GAO determined that:

—The drug budget summary fairly reflected the overall level of outlays by Federal agencies involved in drug abuse programs;

—There are no specific criteria agencies are required to follow in reporting their drug-related expenditures, and agencies do not prepare formal documentation of drug-related expenditures. Criteria used to report drug-related expenditures vary widely among the agencies reviewed;

—The increase in total Federal drug-related outlays from 1981–1985 exceeded the inflation rate by about 19 per cent;

—In 1981, 64 per cent of Federal drug abuse spending was allocated to law enforcement programs and 36 per cent to treatment, prevention and other health-related programs. In 1985, 78 per cent of the total Federal outlay for drug programs went for law enforcement and 22 per cent for health-related programs;

—The increase in drug law enforcement outlays were primarily due to agencies' internal reprogramming, although some new funds were appropriated; and
—Federal spending for drug abuse prevention and treatment decreased 16 per cent in actual outlays from 1981 to 1985 and nearly 38 per cent after inflation.

○